



A FEW WORDS ON REUNION

AND THE

COMING COUNCIL AT ROME.

By GERARD F. COBB, M.A.,

FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON :

G. J. PALMER, 32, LITTLE QUEEN STREET,

LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS.

1869.



P R E F A C E .

THE following remarks make no pretension to being a formal Essay on the subject indicated in the title; they are simply a few fugitive thoughts suggested by the present unsettled state of feeling amongst us, and have no other object than to bring the subject of the approaching Council into greater prominence, and help to make it a topic of more general discussion.

A somewhat disproportionate amount of matter has been relegated to the Appendix in the form of notes. This is for convenience' sake, to prevent the argument itself from being cumbered by such digressions. The reader, however, who is interested in the subject at all will find them in a general way as pertinent to the matter on hand as the text itself,—particularly the extracts on the last few pages,—and as such they are recommended to his notice.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

August, 1869.

A FEW WORDS ON REUNION AND THE COMING COUNCIL AT ROME.

To those who are watching the course of events in the Church of England in their bearing on the Reunion of Christendom, there are few things which cause such grave anxiety as the prevalent attitude of apathy and coldness with regard to the coming Council at Rome.

In a few months nearly one thousand Christian Bishops, most of them men of great natural ability as well as large experience in their episcopal calling, assisted by Assessors who have spent their lives in the study of Holy Scripture and the theological heirloom of the Church, will meet together under the presidency of one who, (whatever views may be taken of his office,) more than any living man commands the reverence and admiration of Christian hearts, and impresses even those who like him least with the almost supernatural power of his benign and saintly presence. This assembly will contain men from every part of the inhabited world, and its collective experience therefore will be as vast and varied as human nature itself. The objects, moreover, of its discussion will be such as concern not merely every member of Christ's Church, but every member of the human race. For whilst on the one hand all who bear the name of Christ ought to have an interest

in any attempt made by such an assembly as this to counsel and assist the faithful in the many dangers to which the tendencies of the age are everywhere exposing them ; so on the other hand, all who are born into the world are vitally interested in any efforts made to unite and invigorate the Church, which is God's great Missionary Society for civilizing and divinizing the whole race of man. It is surely, then, a not very encouraging token of the times that this great Council should have been summoned for these purposes, and yet that the prospect of its Session should seem to excite so little interest and elicit so little sympathy among those who profess to pray daily for the advancement of the Faith, and for the Unity of the Church of Christ. Whatever may be our view of the relative position of the separated portions of the great Christian Family, we cannot suppose that such an important gathering as this can be without its place in the beneficent designs of our one Great Head and Ruler, and as such it has a direct claim upon our respect, our sympathy, and our prayers ; and it cannot be any real fulfilment of this claim that we should be found sitting complacently by, and folding our hands in mute indifference, or, worse still, parading our religious differences and brooding over points in which a supposed slight has been put upon us, by way of justifying ourselves for holding aloof from it altogether.

There are indeed those of us who find very few such differences to dwell upon, and to whom the prospect of the approaching Council is a matter of unmixed joy and thankfulness. Their attitude as Reunionists is a very simple one. Finding no satisfaction in that theory of Revelation which, whilst admitting infallibility to reside in the Church,*

* I am here of course writing for those only, who accept the Principle of Authority and who do not regard each man's interpreta-

nevertheless practically limits God's gracious purposes in this respect to the first nine centuries, and supposes that the *ecclesia docens* has formally ceased to act throughout one half of the Christian era,—a half too which humanly speaking has witnessed in the shape of religious doubts and controversies, as well as in the successive developments and growing needs of the natural mind of man, quite as imperative occasions for the voice of God to be heard on earth, as its predecessor: finding it impossible to reconcile this theory with anything like a reasonable view of the Church as God's organ of utterance to man, or with an adequate fulfilment of Christ's promises with regard to it, they have been led to regard that body which is in communion with the Apostolic See as in the *fullest* sense of the words the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. If, they say, God teaches at all through His Church, that Church, as "the witness and keeper of His Truth," must be *one* identical body, *continuously* existing, patent and known as such in all ages to all mankind; it must be as a city set upon a hill, as a light placed on a candlestick, easily discernible at one glance by the eyes of the enquiring world: and that one body, as an organic society, *visibly* One, *visibly* spread throughout the world (*Catholic*), and *visibly* (*i. e.* demonstrably) descended as *one visible body* from the Apostles of our Lord,—that one body the whole outside world with one consenting voice proclaims to be the Church in communion with the See of S. Peter. The Holy Eastern Church *as such*, *i. e.* in its differentiating feature as one not in communion with

tion of the Bible as the sole Rule of Faith. The question of the relation between the Bible and the Church is too long a one to enter into here, and as I have lately discussed it at some length, the reader, who may be interested in the subject, will pardon my referring him on this head to the "Kiss of Peace," Sequel, Section I.

the Apostolic See, its own title deeds proclaim to be but nine centuries old. *As such*, therefore, she is not Apostolic. Her geographical boundaries again could hardly be considered at the outset of her individual existence as Catholic, neither has she shown since that most unhappy separation such missionary zeal as would justify us in describing her as the Church of the whole world. As for our own Communion, *i. e.* in her differentiating capacity, as one separated from the Apostolic See, no one pretends for a moment to raise such claims on her behalf. If therefore we are to believe in a *visible* Church at all, and if the notes of the Church as given in our Creeds are to be construed in that sense, there can be no doubt as to what the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is. Whilst on the other hand if these notes are to be construed in an *invisible* sense, then the ordinary Protestant theory of the Church as “the totality of regenerate souls,” and of the Bible as the one *ecclesia docens*, is as likely to be right as any other. Neither history, nor logic, as it seems to them leave any safe *via media* between these two alternatives. (*Note A.*) Those of us therefore who hold this view are ready boldly and openly to profess our belief in the Church in communion with the Apostolic See as the one infallible organ by means of which the “faith once delivered to the saints” is preserved in its integrity, and (as each successive occasion may demand) emphasised, illustrated, expanded, and applied for the benefit of the human race.

Nevertheless, such a profession of belief does not involve, in their view, anything inconsistent with a sincere and hearty allegiance to the Anglican Communion. Indeed, *under the present circumstances of the Church*, they have no option but to remain where they are; for they are convinced on the one hand that there is nothing whatever in any authoritative

documents of the English Church which (if left to explain itself apart from the traditionary glosses of a practical Protestantism) contains anything essentially irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome (*Note B.*): whilst on the other they are ready as Reunionists to maintain that no charge of Schism can fairly be brought against them by those in communion with the Holy See. . We are indeed, they will say to them, members of a body not in communion with you, but we deeply deplore this isolation, and are doing our best to heal the breach between us. That breach is none of our making; it is not one for which even our spiritual forefathers three hundred years ago were solely, or even mainly responsible. Political tyranny on the part of those at home, the undue assertion of ecclesiastical power on the part of those abroad, as well as the practical corruption of the Church at large, *forced* us into it. We regret it, indeed, but we could not help it. The fault was on your side, as well as on ours. We are ready, only too ready, to admit our part of it, it remains for you to admit yours.* So far as the Church of England is concerned there has been no schism in the strict and historical sense of the word. We have never put forward the claims of the earlier schismatics, or assumed anything like a Donatist attitude; we have never renounced communion with you; nay, there is nothing whatever in the formal teaching of our Communion which in the least degree implies the existence or the desirability of such a separation;† on the contrary it

* We do not forget that *some* Roman Catholics have already done so. Compare especially the famous passage in Mohler's *Symbolik*, and other such, as quoted by Mr. Oxenham in the Appendix to his truly Catholic "Letter to Father Lockhart" (Longmans, 1866).

† Compare the 30th Canon. "Nay, *so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches in all things which they held and practised, that, &c., &c.*

is distinctly repudiated. Besides, we *cannot* join you on the conditions you practically impose upon us. You demand of us such a surrender as cannot be made *consistently with truth and justice*. You require us, for instance, to say—not formally, indeed, but in effect—that we have no priests and no Sacraments; whilst it is quite plain to us that our present episcopate is in all respects the true and lineal descendant of the Apostolic Mission in this land. You require us to renounce communion with the Church of England on the grounds that she is heretical: we on the other hand, are convinced that there is nothing in her *authorized* teaching which you do not yourselves teach in your own pulpits and Catechisms. That she is actually separated from the centre of visible Catholic unity is a fact deplorable indeed, but too patent to be questioned: that she is wilfully, avowedly, and therefore guiltily schismatical we utterly deny: to say that we ourselves are schismatics is simply to give the lie to the most cherished longing of our hearts. No! we *must* remain where God has placed us, loyal to our own Communion, and to our own Episcopate, loyal at the same time (in spirit) to yours: if we are not of the *body* of your Church, we belong at any rate to its *soul*; and we look forward in quietness and confidence to the day (however distant) when the two Communions will be made one to the infinite joy of Christian hearts, and, as we trust, to the incalculable blessing of millions of our fellow-men. You surely cannot blame *us* for believing with your own Cardinal Wiseman that the national Church is to be the means of restoring our country to the full possession and privileges of the Catholic Faith. You will not grudge *us* a share in the hope expressed by your own De Maistre, that a great future is in store for the Church of England as a means of bringing the separated bodies of the baptized

together, and uniting them in one visible communion and fellowship. It surely can be no great sin in *us* to believe in common with most Continental Catholics who view the progress of events amongst us with unprejudiced * eyes, that the great religious Revival which was commenced by Wesley, carried on by Simeon, started afresh on another level by the great leaders of the Oxford School, and which has now advanced a further stage in the more recent restoration of Catholic Ritual, the Religious Life, and Synodical action, Diocesan as well as Provincial,—that this great movement *can have no other* issue than the ultimate restoration in God's own time of the whole body of the Anglican faithful whether at home, in America, in our colonies, or in our scattered missions throughout the whole world, to visible Catholic unity. That is what *we* mean by *Corporate* Reunion. We mean that as our separation was corporate, so our reconciliation must be corporate. The

* I use this expression with extreme reluctance, but having mixed much with Catholics abroad, and having everywhere noticed the friendly attitude adopted towards the Church of England even by their strictest and most advanced theologians, I am forced most unwillingly to the conclusion that our Roman friends in England, at least as represented in their religious press and controversial literature, do not judge the questions between us entirely on their own merits. I own that the tone we ourselves adopt towards them is often not such as to elicit friendly feelings on their part, and as a Reunionist I deeply regret that it should be so, for angry words and hastily-formed judgments are a terrible obstacle to the cause of peace. At the same time when I contrast the way in which the most rigorous Ultramontanes (I use the word in no hostile spirit) abroad are always anxious to make us out to be *as right as possible*, whereas others at home seem to be as anxious to make us out to be *as wrong as possible*, I cannot help suspecting that the peculiarity of the situation—involving as it does the existence side by side of two rival hierarchies—is occasionally allowed to get the better of a calm and impartial criticism of facts.

guilt of it, or rather, let it in all humility, yet in all justice, be said, our *portion* of the guilt of it, such as it was, was corporately incurred; its punishment during the last three hundred years has been corporately borne: corporate reparation is being now, thank God! slowly yet certainly made; and we must wait and work for the Corporate Reunion that is to follow, still “holding ourselves”—if you will have it so—“accursed from Christ for our brethren’s sake.” That is our view of Corporate Reunion. As to individual secession, as the phrase is, we do not dream of such a thing. When you can *prove* to us that we have no Episcopate, and therefore no Sacraments; when you can *prove* to us that our Communion *as such* is formally and avowedly committed to heretical teaching; when you can *prove* to us that we are not merely outwardly and perforce schismatic, but voluntarily and guiltily so,—personally acquiescing, that is, in our separation from the Holy See from wilful or worldly motives; or when on the other side our Church in *free*, full, and proper Synodical Session, and after a fair debate in every stage of the ecclesiastical Parliament, Diocesan and Provincial, definitely pledges us, as the price of our communion with her, to the acceptance of any doctrine or practice contrary to those of the Catholic Church, *then* we will begin to think about renouncing our allegiance to her. But till then, no amount of declamatory assertion or friendly solicitation on your side, no amount of Episcopal disfavour, of angry popular clamour, or of legal decisions ousting us from the *Establishment* on ours, can shake for a moment our determination to remain true and loyal members of the Church of England. In itself, indeed, nothing could be more delightful than to join you to-morrow. We should thereby escape a deal of worry and annoyance; we should be saying “good-bye!” to years of calumny and

debate; the world would hail us as honest fellows who had done the right thing, and quote us as examples to those we had left behind: we should moreover have everything after our own heart, services we liked, sermons we liked, and a whole world of Church privileges at present denied us; but so long as matters remain as they are on your side and on ours we cannot, we dare not make that sacrifice which the step demands,—a sacrifice not of this world's goods and relationships, but of that which is dearer than love, and more precious than life, the sacrifice, namely, of TRUTH.

Such is the view of Reunion maintained by a small but increasing section of the Anglican Communion, and it is needless to say that *they* at least hail the approaching Council at Rome with feelings of sincere thankfulness and confident expectation. No matter what may be those adverse prospects with regard to it with which rumour is so busy, they cannot forget that the Council will be under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and can deliberate to no other issue than God's glory, and the welfare of all mankind. Amid all the difficulties, dangers, and divisions of Christendom in the present day, they find unfailing comfort in the belief that God will at this crisis, as at many another such, "visit the earth and bless it," and that through the divine influence of this great Assembly at the Vatican, equally as at Nice, Constantinople, and Ephesus, "His way will be made known upon earth, and His saving health among all nations." (*Note C.*)

But it is hardly necessary to remark that this view of Reunion is not that taken as yet by the majority even of professed Reunionists. According to their theory there is no *one* visible Church of Christ on earth at this present time, nor has there been for a period equivalent to one half the whole life of the Christian Mission. Whatever Unity

the Church may have possessed throughout this time in virtue of a doctrinal and Sacramental correspondence, and of its cohesion with its Invisible Head, it has nevertheless outwardly been divided, so that the only answer which could be given to one, who as a stranger begged to have the society of Christ's Church pointed out to him, would be; "there is no *one* such body now on earth, there are *three* such;" and to an enquirer who in a case of doctrinal difficulty should have demanded, "Where is the one true interpreter in matters of faith?" the answer would be, "The Creeds and Canons of the Undivided Church;" or, should his doubts arise from more recent phases of human thought, from the inalienable heritage of the mental developments through which mankind has passed since the Great Schism, then his appeal at any time throughout that long period must have been met by the reply "there *is* no such, you must *wait* for a General Council."* To those who hold

* It is not here forgotten that this theory of the Church allows an appeal to the *communis sententia* of the three separated bodies in matters on which the undivided Church has not yet spoken. Still this method of arriving at an answer to the question—What is truth? is at the best too cumbrous and uncertain a process for the ordinary faithful, and when contrasted with the living voice and definite decrees of the Undivided Body seems to imply a practical cessation of the powers of the *ecclesia docens* during the latter half of the Christian era.

In case any reader of the *Kiss of Peace* should be inclined to tax me with inconsistency in this matter, as having myself appealed to this same source as the *Rule of Faith*, (see Sequel, pp. 68, 69,) I may, perhaps, be allowed to remark here, that I merely did so for argument's sake, as applying the principle of authority in *that particular form* which I had reason to suppose would be that likely to be accepted by the *largest* number of my readers. At the same time in order to avoid misconceptions I distinctly stated that "that was not the *only* answer that could be given to the question;—Where is the Creed of the Catholic Church to be found?" And further on again, (pp. 112, 113,) I endeavoured to make it plain to the reader what the real Rule of Faith, according to my view, was. It is well, perhaps

this view, therefore, the approaching Council at Rome is merely a *topical* Council (as it has been called), and can have no claim to infallibility. "We have yet to wait for an Œcumenical Synod,"—they will say—"may God in His mercy send it us; we pray for it; we long for it; every day of the present distress increases the necessity for it; but we see no prospect of it in connexion with the Vatican." And so they turn away their heads in the bitterness of disappointed hopes, and begin once more to brood in silent sorrow over the failures and the wrongs of a divided Christendom.

But *why* should they do so? is there absolutely no hope of better things? and will the *fault be entirely on one side* if the approaching Council be—so far as regards their purposes—a failure?

True, the Eastern Bishops have rejected the Papal invitation, and as yet show no signs of coming. It is certainly a matter of deep regret to many in the Roman Communion as well as to ourselves that the summons issued was not couched in more courteous terms, and did not show a fuller recognition of the august claims of an episcopate, which, though it has kept aloof so long from the centre of visible unity, ought nevertheless to command even on the most stringently Roman view of the Church the veneration and regard of Christian people. We could have much desired too to see some conciliatory allusion to the fact that in the origin of this sad schism the fault was not altogether on one side, and that the attempts which have been subsequently made to heal it have not always been carried out with that scrupulous fairness and integrity which the occasion demanded. But, unfortunately, it is not merely to mention this, because that part of the subject has not always been understood as it was intended it should be.

on these grounds that the Eastern Bishops have rejected the Pope's invitation. They take offence not at the language of the summons, but at the summons itself. How dare the Pope of Rome take upon himself to summon a Council at all without consulting *us*? He is merely one Patriarch out of many, and one too who by his errors has denied the Orthodox Faith, and cut himself off from the Communion of the Orthodox Church. How can he expect us to attend a Council of his summoning? Let him recant his errors, and join Communion with us, and then we will begin to think about an Ecumenical Council; till then we must content ourselves with reiterating our now nearly Millennial protest against his preposterous and unscriptural assumptions. Such is, in effect, the purport of the Eastern reply.

Now into the nature of the dispute between the two Communions this is hardly the occasion to enter; but let us suppose for a moment that the Western Church is wrong, and the Eastern right—can this refusal of theirs to attend the Council *even then* be made to appear consistent with a sincere desire for the Reunion of Christendom? Does it not, in the first place, involve a *perpetuation ad infinitum* of its divisions?

Let us look at it for a moment in this light. The most numerous, the most wide-spread, the most vigorous of these two Christian episcopates has, through its head (in whom even the Greeks profess to recognise a Primacy of honour) invited the other to a conference, with the expressed hope that it might tend to their Reunion. There is a difference between the two, a long standing quarrel. It is possible that by meeting together and discussing the points of disagreement their reconciliation might be effected; at any rate an opportunity is afforded for such an attempt. Why is it declined? Simply upon grounds which render all attempts

at reconciliation absolutely and finally impossible. For how can a quarrel between two persons be settled, if the one when invited by the other to come and settle it makes the very existence of the quarrel itself his ground for refusing to see him. And yet this attitude has been hailed by us with very general approbation, and the answers of the Eastern patriarchs have been lauded to the skies by professed Reunionists, chuckled and gloated over by the daily press as a delicious back-hander for their old enemy the Pope, and solemnly quoted in one of our own Provincial Synods* as an unparalleled source of satisfaction to the whole of Protestant Christendom.

Oh! for a little more of that Divine charity which "seeketh not her own!" or even of that more common form of it that "maketh the whole world kin!" Surely lips that utter daily lamentations over the wounds of Christ's Mystical Body might have framed a softer answer. "My brother of Rome," it might have been said, "is undoubtedly wrong. His error proclaims itself anew on the forefront of his invitation. Nevertheless he invites me to come to him. Despite our quarrel we have (thank God!) a common Faith to defend. The Divine nature of our one Lord and of His Church is, alas! being everywhere assailed to the infinite peril of souls. Why should I not then sink my legitimate claims in view of the present distress, and take counsel with my brother for the common good? It may be that in the fulness of our zeal and love for our common Lord our hearts will soften towards each other, and enable us quietly to discuss together those difficulties which have kept us so long asunder to the unfathomable sorrow of our crucified Redeemer, and the grievous loss of souls.

* See the Speech of the Dean of Westminster in the Jerusalem Chamber, as reported in the *Guardian* of Wednesday, July 7th.

Those difficulties are surely not insoluble. They are simply *historical* questions after all ; and modern research has done much to collect facts concerning them and to elucidate their bearing. They must therefore admit of adjustment in an amicable conference. I have no reason to suppose that my brother of Rome will not discuss them candidly and fully with me. At any rate I have no right to *say* that he will not until I have tried."

To come under protest, or even to come that you may protest, is surely a very different thing from protesting that you will not come. Which of these, it may be asked, is most consistent with a sincere desire for the Reunion of Christendom ? (*Note D.*)

And now to turn to ourselves. Is there after all any such cause of offence at the treatment we have received as to justify this prevalent indifference to the coming Council ? Are we not really judging the conduct of our Roman brethren as if *they started on similar grounds of principle* to ourselves, instead of endeavouring as we always should in a case of this kind to place ourselves *in the position* of our opponents before estimating the precise significance of their acts.

It is said that the Pope has acted in a most un-Catholic manner ; that he has "un-Churched" us, and classed us with Protestants ; that our episcopate has been studiously and designedly ignored. But is this entirely the case ? and if it is, have we no share in the fault of it ? or again, is there no *other* way of explaining the situation of things save that currently adopted ?

Let us take the first charge. The Pope, we say, has acted in an un-Catholic manner in doing what he has done. This really means when we come to look into it that he has acted *on his view* of Catholicity, and not on ours. Could

we, however, fairly expect him to act otherwise? Is our complaint against him reasonable? Would it be allowed to be so in the ordinary relations of life? Should we for a moment admit it to be so as against ourselves?

For how stands the matter? The Pope has a theory with which we disagree. He acts upon this theory, and we take offence and say he ought to have acted thus and thus. But to say this is simply a *petitio principii*, and brings us once more to a state of hopeless irreconcilability, and a permanently divided Christendom. It is the *theory* surely at which we ought to take offence, not the action based upon it; and if this be so, why do we not take the opportunity which the Council presents for endeavouring to come to some mutual understanding as regards the point at issue. If when an occasion presents itself for a discussion of differences we refuse to avail ourselves of it because the invitation to do so contains that with which we do not agree—what possible hope is there of ever having those differences discussed and solved? We shall never come to an understanding at all unless we are ready to forget our quarrel for the moment in order that we may thereby secure the proper means and agencies for mutual conference and reconciliation.

When we consider the magnitude of the interests involved in Reunion, interests practically affecting the whole human race, is there not something sadly humiliating in all this contention over the preliminaries? No amount of supposed un-Catholic procedure on the part of the Pope can prevent the Council being what it is, viz., by far the most valuable opportunity for a thorough investigation on both sides of those points whereon Christians not in Communion with the Apostolic See differ from those that are, *that any existing organization* (be it Catholic or the reverse) could possibly

offer to the Christian world. If we refuse to avail ourselves of it simply because we expect our Roman friends to acquiesce in our view of things without any discussion whatsoever, we shall most certainly be acting a very foolish part, as well as taking a very heavy responsibility on our own shoulders. To decline to discuss differences, until there are no differences left to discuss is, to use an apt though homely illustration, very like refusing to go into the water until you can swim.

Again as to our being "un-Churched." Is the fault here so entirely on one side? Have we taken any such special steps towards obtaining from our Roman brethren a different determination of the question of our lawful Church organization, as might fairly be expected of us in a matter of such infinite importance to ourselves?

The case stands thus. There is a *communis sententia* among the Bishops in communion with the Apostolic See to the effect that we Anglicans have not retained the Apostolic ministry. Excepting in the case of a few Anglo-Roman controversialists of the present day, who endeavour to argue the matter on other grounds, this *communis sententia* is purely traditional, and owes its origin to a statement of the case which subsequent research has proved to be about as near an approach to historical fact as the fable of Pope Joan. We profess on the other hand to be in possession of documentary evidence amply sufficient to reverse this traditionary verdict. Yet what have we done to lay it before them and obtain a reversal? We surely do not expect them to "Church" us again by the light of nature! Nor ought we to be surprised if they construe the fact of our not having done this into a proof either that we have no such evidence, or that we ourselves regard it as somewhat too shaky to pass muster with their theological jury.

If in a case of this kind our defence has not been forthcoming, what reason have we to blame the Roman Episcopate if we suffer judgment by default.* (*Note E.*)

And need we after all be so very angry at being classed with Protestants—if it be true that we have been so—when at least half our brother-Churchmen rejoice at it, and are never tired of proclaiming to the world that we *are* a Protestant Church, a creation of the sixteenth century, specially commissioned to wage war with the Papal Antichrist to the end of time. Even regarding our Communion

* There is another way in which we may suffer judgment by default, which I would commend to the very serious attention of those who seem inclined to let matters go their own way, and make no approaches towards this Council. It is this. There is a certain section of the Anglo-Roman body—whether they be as numerous as they are noisy it is impossible to say—who do not believe in the Reunion movement at all. “The Anglican Church,” say they, “is heretical, and in schism, and therefore absolutely cut off from all real Church life. It is impossible then that there should be anything real in this so-called Catholic Revival. It is simply another phase of Protestantism on a higher level, that is all. It will soon reach its zenith, and then rapidly fade away as similar movements have done before.” It is perhaps unnecessary to point out to the *English* reader the obvious practical objections† to such a theory as this; but to *foreigners*, with their very insufficient knowledge of the facts of the case, it may be made to appear plausible enough. And it is well to bear in mind that such a view must receive irresistible confirmation in their minds, if we, when such an opportunity for testing our sincerity as Reunionists is offered, should coldly keep aloof and refuse to make any overtures for the removal of those barriers which separate the Church of England from its Mother Church of Rome. It would be most deplorable, if through any lukewarmness on our part, such a view as this should be allowed to take possession of the minds of those who are to attend this Council.

† It is matter of great satisfaction to reflect that this has already been done for us by Anglo-Romans themselves. See Ambrose Phillipps De Lisle’s essay on the Future Unity of Christendom. I believe that there are *many* in the Anglo-Roman body who would adopt his view of the matter; but at present one *hears* very little of them.

from the most favourable point of view, can we say that she has done very much during the centuries of her separation from the Holy See towards vindicating her Catholicity even in the Anglican sense of the word? Does she present herself to her Catholic brethren on the Continent in any very marked contrast to the Protestant Sects? What of her Continental chaplains!* What of her travelling laity, whose conduct even under the eye of the Holy Father himself is often that in which gentlemanly feeling, much more Catholic devotion, is conspicuous by its absence! Speaking

* Many of our Continental chaplains seem to regard the English service abroad as a most desirable opportunity for convincing the Catholic natives of the deadly and pernicious character of their faith. There was one such who being stationed in a very large and flourishing Catholic town in the South of France thought it necessary to preach for upwards of an hour (so it was said) on the text, "The city was wholly given to idolatry."

Another of our chaplains who was in the habit of holding public prayer-meetings, with addresses in English, French, and German, in which all kinds of sectarian pastors of the place were invited to take part, met with a severe reprimand from an American Bishop who was staying in the town, and whom he had most innocently asked to come and preside on one of these occasions. "I cannot think, sir," said the Bishop, "how you can find it consistent with your position as a Priest of the Catholic Church to invite these various denominationalists to your own church, and there unite with them in solemn acts of public worship." "My lord," replied the chaplain, "I thought that as my building is not consecrated, I might have what service I liked in it." "It strikes me, Sir," said the Bishop, "that if you lay so very little stress on the consecration or non-consecration of your building, it were better for you to lay so much the more stress on the *consecration of your own person*. Good morning, Sir!"

I do not mention this fact from any sympathy with that Anglican narrowness which will have nothing to do with Dissenters. Let us fraternize with them by all means so long as we do not sacrifice our own principles. But in the above case principles were distinctly sacrificed, and we cannot wonder that the Catholics of the place regarded our chaplain as to all intents and purposes a pure Protestant pastor and nothing more.

from our own Anglican point of view of the divisions of Christendom, have we ever joined as a Church in any one distinct corporate act which implied a recognition of that Primacy of honour which *all admit* is accorded to the See of Rome by the Canons of the First Four Councils? Have we ever shown any regard for its occupant as Patriarch of the West, I had almost said as a Christian Bishop at all? Why, it was only two years since that we gave him a deliberate snub in favour of the Eastern Episcopate.* If, in spite of all our vehement appeals to the decrees and usages of the Primitive Church, we content ourselves with sending our letters of Episcopal greeting to the Greeks and not to him, can we wonder that he should send his invitations to their Episcopate, and not to ours!

But there is really another means of accounting for the absence of this invitation, and one which I have very good reason to suppose is far nearer the truth than any other.

We are apt to forget that the Bull of Indiction and the subsequent Letters of Invitation are two very different things. In the Bull *all* Bishops, and those who claim to have a seat on an Œcumenical Council are summoned.

* The allusion is of course to the sending of copies of the Lambeth Encyclical to the Greek Bishops and not to those of Western Christendom. The fact itself is perhaps hardly to be regretted, for although it is perfectly true, as Dr. Manning said, that the letter contained nothing but what would admit of a thoroughly Catholic interpretation, still the passage about the Pope's "universal sovereignty" and the "mediation of the Blessed Virgin" might at first sight have been regarded by many Western Bishops as a not over conciliatory form of salutation. Nevertheless, if we, whether from the contents of the missive itself or from any other cause, choose to send our letters to one portion of the Christian Episcopate and not to the other, we have no right to be surprised if we find ourselves treated in the same way. It was certainly just as much an "un-Churching" of the nine hundred Bishops of the Roman Communion, as theirs is of our ninety.

That this summons includes the Greek Bishops, is evident from the allusion made to it in the Pope's subsequent letter to them. It does not, therefore, follow that because no direct Letters of Invitation have been sent to our Bishops, they are not supposed to be included equally with the Greeks in those summoned by the Bull of Indiction. It is perfectly possible that Pius the Ninth, knowing a little about English Protestantism, and also having had his overtures of peace* to the Greeks so curtly and summarily rejected, may have thought it wiser to abstain from any direct negotiations with our own Episcopate, for fear of eliciting a reply modelled on a particular passage in the Lambeth Encyclical. One of our Bishops has already addressed him in a somewhat similar strain.† If they all did so, it would simply make the prospects of Reunion more hopeless than ever. How much more prudent, therefore, we might say, is the course which has been actually adopted.

Our Bishops have been summoned. If they choose to go, they can. If they do not go, the responsibility lies with them. Should the longing for Reunion really take effect among them, they *will* go: if not, then no direct invitation at all is surely far better than an invitation refused. The difficulty is thus left to work out its own solution. If any of them feel so disposed, they have only to go and claim their seats as Christian Bishops in accord-

* Apart from the formalities of address, &c., nothing could be more conciliatory, or more earnest in its appeal for Reunion, than the Letter of the Pope to the Eastern Bishops.

† See "*Responsio Anglicana Litteris Apostolicis Pii Papæ IX., ad omnes Protestantes aliosque Acathalicos.*" (Rivingtons.) This Lettèr was first published anonymously, but is now freely advertised as the writing of the present Bishop of Lincoln, and has been referred to as such in the Lower House of Convocation.

ance with the terms of the Bull.* That they would be admitted to the deliberations of the Council, there can be no doubt. At least it has been said so by more than one of those who are most *au fait* with Conciliar matters. That it is the express desire of the authorities that they should come I should also gather from the same source to be beyond question. Should no further invitation be sent, such as was sent to the Greeks, it is simply because the unfortunate condition of things on *our* side renders the result of such an invitation highly problematical, not to say hazardous. Can we blame Rome for this? Is it not, after all, our own fault if our "Episcopate has"—as people say it has—"been studiously ignored?"

But to turn to another aspect of the question—"There is no hope that Reunion will come of this Council," is a prevalent cry. "Everything will go one way. It will be simply a *packed* meeting debating a foregone conclusion. Papal Infallibility and the ratification of the syllabus in its most offensive form†—that is all we can expect from it.

* At the moment of sending this to the press I have received a letter from an eminent Roman Catholic theologian who has just been at Rome, in which occurs the following sentence: "If your Bishops believe themselves to be Bishops they ought to go to the Council; if they do not go, it will be tantamount to an implicit acknowledgment on their part that they are *not* Bishops at all. People high in authority at Rome have told me that if any Anglican Bishops or theologians present themselves, they will not only be joyfully welcomed, but will be received with every possible distinction."

† I say "in its most offensive form," because this much-abused document, like many others, is capable of somewhat different interpretations, and it is quite possible that even if it were to be made the basis of the conciliar proceedings, it might be so moulded and coloured by debate, as to be really acceptable to all but those who reject the principle of authority *in toto*. A German *Protestant* pastor of considerable ability has declared it to be the "most rational (vernünftiges) utterance" of this century. It is plain, therefore,

The Pope is in the hands of the Jesuits. He speaks in the *Civiltà*. Its programme will be carried by acclamation. The Council will only sit for a few weeks, and then all will be over. On the one side the Infallible Father and his faithful Jesuits stamping out the last embers of intellectual freedom and independent life in the Church : on the other, education, civilization, and political government finally and irrevocably alienated from all true Christian principle, and lapsing more and more hopelessly into the Christless extravagances of our modern Paganism !”

Now there is no denying the *existence* of a party distinctly clamorous for new definitions of Faith, and for an uncompromising centralization of all ecclesiastical power in the Holy See. But that this party is to carry the day in the approaching Council is by no means so certain. The fact is we have got somewhat blinded—as is so often the case—by the use of a party name, and in our furious and in many instances utterly unjust and unmeaning protestations against what we call Ultramontanism we have mixed up friends and opponents alike, and have neglected to perceive that there are “Ultramontanes *and* Ultramontanes.” Now if by Ultramontanes we mean those who, as a purely abstract question of theology, would be prepared to give their assent to the proposition “that when the Pope acting as the Head of the Episcopate, and having assured himself of their concurrence, formally promulgates a definition on points of faith and morals in the form of an address to the whole Church, and declares it to be binding upon all the faithful, he speaks under the unerring guidance of the Holy Ghost,” then there is no doubt that Ultramontanism is vastly in the

that there are different points of view from which it may be regarded, and we may have been led into an injustice in so readily adopting the general tone of the secular press on the subject.

ascendant. In fact there would not perhaps be found a score of Bishops in the whole Roman Episcopate who would withhold their assent from such a proposition. But when you come to the *practical* question as to whether it is expedient that such a proposition should at this present juncture be decreed an Article of Faith, and made binding on the faithful laity throughout the world, and whether in a general way such questions as these should form part of the business of the approaching Council at all, then it will be found that what we are in the habit of calling Ultramontanism is itself divided into two distinct parties, of which the party in favour of such a decree, though possibly* at present outnumbering the other, would certainly shrink from pressing its views in the face of a minority of great intellectual power, and, what is more to the point, of far wider acquaintance with the present state of things in the outside world. In a country like Italy where the population is divided into staunch Catholics on one side, and on the other those who have thrown Christianity and all principle of authority, civil as well as religious, overboard altogether, it is perhaps just possible that the episcopate with their vision limited to their own horizon, and regarding therefore the non-Catholic world as somewhat too far gone, should seek to strengthen the position of the Church itself by some such new definition. But the French and German Episcopates, including to my personal knowledge those who have openly professed their

* It is very hard to say what the numerical strength of this party is. We know very little indeed of the views of the Spanish Episcopate as to this question of the *expediency* of a decree, and as regards the Italian, the press is no safe guide at all in the matter. In the letter alluded to above (p. 21), the writer, who has had perhaps as good means of ascertaining as any one, says, "I believe that the number of those who would regard such a subject as inopportune is by far the most numerous."

belief that the Infallibility of the Pope as defined above is the only logical position that a Catholic can maintain on the question—they hold very different views of the matter. With them the great object would seem to be to strain every nerve to *reconcile* the world to the Church instead of alienating it, and in any case to draw together into one all those who, however they may vary on other points, are at one in their views of the Person and Office of Christ. And one cannot help hoping, in spite of the Anglo-Roman press, that in the English and American (Roman) Episcopate too there will be many who will take a more *practical* view of things, and adopt a more moderate and conciliatory tone as regards the present and prospective relations of the Church and the world. And thus it is surely not unreasonable to expect that when the matter comes to be thoroughly discussed at the Council, the Bishops of the Latin race, learning from their brethren that the wide world beyond the Alps is not after all so far gone as to be beyond all hope of recovery, will have their views materially influenced in a more liberal direction.

As for such an idea as carrying a new dogma by acclamation, with no previous discussion whatever, such a thing has never occurred to any one save a few sensation writers in the religious press. Those who are at all acquainted with the present state of feeling in the Roman Episcopate would know it to be simply impossible.

But perhaps some one will say it is all very well to try and take a brighter view of things; but what *you* say is after all *mere conjecture*; whereas we *know* from the *Civiltà* on the one hand, and the *Allgemeine Zeitung* on the other, what the *real* state of things is. We know the influence of the Jesuits throughout the whole Roman Catholic body. We know, too, from high diplomatic authority what has all

along been the policy of the Roman Curia. You cannot therefore expect us to take a more hopeful view, simply on the strength of such vague possibilities as may choose to commend themselves to your own somewhat sanguine imagination.

Now I have no *wish* to put myself forward as an authority on these matters, still less unnecessarily to blaze abroad what has been told me, not indeed as a matter of *secret* confidence, but still through the ordinary methods of private *personal* communication. Still, where the interests at stake are so enormous, and where an incorrect notion of the actual condition of things practically leads to a state of uncertainty and dismay deplored by all alike, it were foolish, nay, culpable, to abstain from an endeavour at least to relieve to some extent the very wide-spread feeling of anxiety with which this whole question of the coming Council is regarded. Let me then just briefly state what I *know* to be the state of things from personal communication with some of those who are to take part in the Council itself.* In the first place it is a fact that the Council has been called together *mainly*, if not entirely, with a view to those outside the Communion of the Church of Rome, and especially—so it was said—in regard of the present state of things in the Anglican Communion. It is quite certain that everything will be done to bring about a Reunion of Christendom consistently with truth, and that the Roman authorities are ready to make very large concessions to the separated bodies—*only they expect them to take the initiative* in the

* I do not wish, of course, to mention names, but for fear of misconception as to the nature of my authorities, I may mention that they include some very distinguished members of the Continental Episcopate, as well as others officially connected with the Council; and that my information as regards the state of things at Rome is *direct* and is no mere current hearsay.

matter. The greatest anxiety is expressed that we* in particular should show some signs of availing ourselves of this opportunity for making overtures of reconciliation. With regard to the *Civillà*,† I have been assured on authority which it is impossible to question that it is no indication whatever of the tone of feeling among those actually engaged on Conciliar business at Rome ; and that *there*, that is in the preliminary committees, &c., the “ utmost moderation ” prevails. With regard to the Jesuits nothing could be more utterly at variance with truth than the general rumours about them. There are none more assiduous in their endeavours to promote moderation and to prevent anything being brought forward that may stand in the way of Reunion than they. I have the authority of one of the most famous of the order in Northern Europe—and one too who is directly engaged in Council work, for making this statement. Their great episcopal patron in Germany, the man against whom the German press is never weary of aiming its bitterest shafts of abuse as the great champion of Ultramontanism on this side of the Alps, has assured me that he never loses an opportunity of protesting against any such disastrous course being taken as that of introducing such subjects as those alluded to at the Council, or of taking any steps which might prove a hindrance to the Reunion of Christendom. Only a few days since I received a letter from an *Italian* of the order, who had recently been at Rome, which breathed the same spirit of practical good sense and moderation, and saying in particular that great

* Such, it will be remembered, was the view taken by De Maistre of the natural order of proceeding, that it would be *our* office to originate a movement of reconciliation.

† Even the *Allgemeine Zeitung* admits that this supposed official organ of the Roman Curia, so far from retaining the Papal *imprimatur*, has been characterized by the Holy Father as “ *imprudenza*.”

weight would be given to anything written or said on *our* part as regards the subjects of deliberation. One of the most learned of the order in England, referring to the policy adopted by an influential section of the Anglo-Roman body, told a Roman Catholic friend of mine the other day that he regarded it simply as "*Ultramontanism gone mad!*" All I can say is that if the Pope be in the hands of the Jesuits, it is a very good thing for us; he might be in plenty worse. The Jesuits, whatever else we may find to say against them, are shrewd men of the world, keen observers of the tendencies of the age, and practical and liberal in their method of dealing with them. No doubt on the abstract question of Papal Infallibility they are what it is our fashion to call Ultramontane to a man; but it does not in the least degree follow that they are not keenly alive to the impolicy of doing anything at such a crisis as this which would tend to bring Catholicism into still greater disfavour with non-Catholic Christians. One or two of them may sound their trumpet in a different tone in the *Civiltà* and a few other similar publications, but the leaning of the order in general, and especially of those in authority among them, will be found, I am convinced, to be towards decidedly moderate and conciliatory counsels.

It would really be most unfair to our kind friends abroad—and we have many such in quarters where we least expect it—if we allowed ourselves to give way to a feeling of despair, simply on the strength of mere newspaper reports or of alarmist pamphlets based upon them. Of course no one will say that these have absolutely no foundation. But they are vastly exaggerated in themselves, and they assume a still more disproportionate shape in our minds, because we have not allowed ourselves thoroughly to review the other side of the picture. There can be no doubt

that if we will only bestir ourselves, and either directly or indirectly make our views and wishes known with regard to the coming Council, we may be able to render incalculable aid to the cause of Christ and His Church in its relations to the modern world. Knowing what great expectations are now entertained of England, even at Rome itself—how strong a feeling there is that with her straightforward honest character, with her prevailing Christian orthodoxy and deep religious instincts, with her wise, sober, yet generous and progressive Conservatism—in all these points forming such a bright contrast to the flippancy, the irreligion, the restless and unprincipled Liberalism of the Continental nations; knowing as I do how great a part she is expected to play in the new era of a re-invigorated Church and a re-christianised world, I cannot help expressing my conviction that if we, from any feelings of insular pride or mortification, from any petty ungenerous sticklings at formalities, from any reluctance to part with old prejudice and suspicions and to sink for a time even what we may hold to be legitimate grounds of complaint against our neighbours—(seeing that by that course alone we can humanly speaking hope for their final adjustment)—if we from any false timidity at home, or from any nursing of fantastic fears as to the probable issue of things abroad—if from any want of large-hearted Christian Charity and Christian Liberalism, as well as of faith in the supernatural government of the Church—if we from any of these causes hang back at this particular juncture, and refuse to take our part in the great work now open to us, we shall have ourselves to thank if our prayers for the Reunion of Christendom are not answered. God only helps those that help themselves: and we cannot doubt that He has sent this Council for *us*, as well as for others; and that it does present a very distinct

opportunity, if we would only use it, for offering to fulfil our part in healing the divisions of Christendom. Let it not be forgotten that on those who believe that the "Church's authority in controversies of Faith" cannot be exercised until the three Episcopates are once more united, the obligation to sink for the present all differences with a view to their re-assembling together in Synod rests with far greater weight than on others. Those of us who believe the coming Council to be in any case Œcumenical and its decrees, therefore, infallible, might be pardoned if we sat silently by, and simply awaited its formal and final utterances. Not so those who believe in the Branch Theory of the Church. And yet what is their present attitude with regard to it? This Council can be no matter of congratulation to us, they say, it is not Œcumenical, and cannot be: it were better, if it had never been called at all; it will only be one barrier more between us and the realisation of our hopes. But whose fault will it be if the coming Council be not Œcumenical? Is it the fault of those who have called it and who attend it, or of those who when invited to attend refuse to do so? Surely this objection that the Council is not Œcumenical makes it all the more incumbent on objectors to forget their grievance—if there be such—as regards the way and method of the invitation, and adopt a policy of conciliation and friendly recognition with a view to making it so.* Let the Anglican Communion at

* Even on our own view of things we have not the same footing of refusal as the Greeks: for we all allow that Rome is our Mother-Church, and her Bishop Patriarch of the West. Let her treat us as she may, our filial obligation must remain the same. We owe our spiritual birth to her. The Primatial chair of St. Augustine is but a splinter from the Apostolic Seat of St. Gregory. It is not for us to refuse a daughter's love, however much "she may have provoked her child to wrath." In the world of natural relationship, no one would

any rate contribute its share towards its Œumenicity; and it is surely not impossible that if we adopt a more friendly attitude in the matter, we might be the means of winning the Greeks to do the same. What other possible chance is there—it may fairly be asked—of getting an Œecumenical Council, than the one now offered? What Episcopate could form the nucleus of such a Council save the Roman? What Prince could call one save he whose temporal crown is the oldest, and whose spiritual subjects are the most numerous in the world? Do we expect to see a General Council at Lambeth, or at Moscow? Is it likely that any crowned head in Europe, would be allowed by his brother-sovereigns to call one? Were it not better then to adopt a more practical line, and look facts in the face rather than give way to dreary complaints and comfortless waiting upon impossibilities.

So too with regard to the popular outcry against Ultramontaniam. If we are really afraid that a narrow ecclesiopolitical code, an enervating policy of ecclesiastical centralization, and new and premature canons of dogma and morals are going to triumph, it would surely not be well to let them do so without a struggle. The question then arises, whether querulous denunciations at home like those of the Protestants who assembled the other day at Worms, will be as effective as the more practical and out-spoken course, of going ourselves to Rome and claiming to be heard as men zealous for Christ, and labouring for the good of His Church.

The subjects on which the Council will deliberate are topics of deep interest to all who accept Christianity at all seek to justify such conduct as ours will have been, should we *now* keep aloof. Be the parental rejection as cruel and scornful as the most hostile pen could paint it, our own dutifulness will be only so much the higher exercise of that divine charity without which all our other doings, even our prayers for Reunion, are nothing worth.

as a form of objective truth, revealed to man from a source exterior to himself. The task immediately before it is to place our common faith as Christians on a firm basis in view of the many forms of Anti-Christian thought now current in the world. Materialism, Pantheism, Rationalism in all its forms and stages, consequent and inconsequent, covered and avowed, Indifferentism, Secularism—all these phases of human thought are to be sifted and examined by the united intelligence of Christendom, their principles clearly enunciated, their fundamental points of divergence from the Faith distinctly laid down, their many points of agreement with it (for they all have that) brought to light and made the bridge over which all save wilful wanderers can be guided back again. Codes of Church Discipline now practically obsolete will have to be revised, and adapted to the requirements of the age. Clerical education will have to be placed on a level with secular in all such matters as are requisite to enable theology and “culture,” Faith and Science to be thoroughly *en rapport* with one another, and work harmoniously side by side. That will be the work of the Church in her own immediate province. But beyond this, she—as the salt of the earth—has to bring her regenerating influence to bear on the kingdoms of this world. The civil order needs to be reminded that Christ claims *it* also as His own, and that though *free* to take a lower course if it chooses, it cannot build itself upon any save a Christian foundation, without materially sacrificing even the temporal welfare of mankind. True, the Church claims no right to *interfere with* the civil order. (*Note F.*) In the world political the majesty of the law must reign supreme. No powers ecclesiastical can lift up so much as their little finger against it. *Direct* dealings with the State—save of its own will and consent by way of Concordat—the Church knows

none. But the Council will appeal with confidence to the conscience and hearts of the Christian people and their rulers, and if they be her true sons in the spiritual order they will show themselves to be so in the civil order also.

Freedom, civil and religious ! that is the great cry of the age : and it is a cry for which the Church is ready with her answer—“*It shall be yours.*” You talk of a “Free Christianity ;” you say that each man should be *free* to think and express himself in religion as his heart dictates. A settled creed, a uniform worship—these you say are your abhorrence ; they are irrational, they are unnatural. See the endless variety of nature, no one thing the duplicate of another. See what infinite dissimilarity there is in man, no one mind, no one heart, no one face after the pattern of another. And yet you expect to mould us all into one groove, and that groove too one and the same for all generations, for the babe-man of the first centuries of the Christian era as well as for the full-grown adult of these latter days.

True, says the Church, you speak the truth, but only half the truth, which is a lie. You talk of the infinite variety of man, how each differs from the other and will do to the end of time, but you have forgotten that there is infinite similitude as well as infinite variety—there is uniform identity, as well as innumerable individualities. There is one common groundwork which underlies them all : else, if each differed altogether from each, wherein were he *man*. In correspondence, therefore, with this *community* of man I proclaim to you the existence of a *common* body of Truth, necessary for all alike, and I give you a common God to worship, revealed in the Person of Jesus Christ. Your charge therefore is true that I demand a settled creed, a

uniform worship. But here again you have only stated half a truth, which, in the practical application you make of it, is a lie. For you omit to state that though I provide a common idea and object of worship—the *mode of its realization in act* is infinitely varied. You have forgotten, when you talk of my uniformity, that though the groundwork is one and the same, the outward expression is allowed to take every possible shape that the individualities of man can require. I provide all styles and occasions of worship, short and long, simple and elaborate, private and public—suitable to every peculiarity of age and sex, of race and clime. As regards the accessories too of this common worship I sanction every conceivable variety from the bare walls and simple altar of a Cistercian Oratory to the glitter and pageantry of S. Peter's. So too with regard to Dogma. It is true that I am "the keeper and witness" of a given body of truth, which is not the accidental and fluctuating product of the individual intellect, but a revelation from without, serviceable for all races and generations of the world. That I say, is true; but it is only half a truth. You have forgotten, that though this *one* deposit alone is given, as corresponding to the common and identical groundwork of the human mind—yet it is a deposit capable of such infinite variety in its application and of such unlimited development in the intellectual expression of it, as enables it to meet in all ages the growing needs of men. Neither does its acceptance in the least degree fetter the energies of the individual intellect or imperil the freedom of the individual conscience. For *when once in firm possession of it* and so long as he retains possession of it the Christian can give free and fearless play to all his intellectual activities in a way which cannot fail to satisfy the most ample ambitions of the human mind. On both points therefore you are

partly right and partly wrong: you are right in calling attention to human variety on the one hand and to uniformity in revealed truth on the other; you are wrong in having forgotten, what you surely cannot deny, that man though varying in the individual, is nevertheless uniform in the kind, and that Revealed Truth though one in itself, is capable of indefinite expansion and development in the Church, and has many sides, as well as various modes of expression.

So too as regards the civil order. Freedom is now the universal cry. Away with prescriptive rights! Down with class interest! Let each man have his swing, and take his chance! we know no king but the will of the people.

Has the Church no reply to this? Yes; certainly. Leaven your state with the Christian principle, she will say—give your children a Christian education—bring your public morality into harmony with Christian ethics—and you will have the most Liberal form of government possible for man. Christianity is in itself the highest and purest form of democracy that the world has ever seen: and a truly Christian government—no matter what may be the precise outward form in which it will be for the time expressed—(that must depend upon the stage of development of the *natural* man in each particular nation)—a truly Christian government will secure the highest amount of individual freedom, consistent with personal happiness and security. Let us then hear no more of the antagonism between Liberalism and Catholicism. There can be no such in the *true* sense of either word. A state which contradicts the Christian principle can never be truly Liberal. Christ is the only sure foundation-stone for the Palace of Freedom. Where His Spirit is there is liberty. In Him all barriers of race, class, and sex are thrown down. The kingdoms of

this world are moreover His; not indeed by any direct exercise of ecclesiastical control, but in virtue of His claim and influence over the natural order of things; and to cut yourselves adrift from Him, is to cut yourselves off from the only true source of progressive freedom, and to submit to the inevitable, devastating, and never-ending oscillations of Despotism and Anarchy.

In view of such questions as these, one would have thought it impossible that Christian men, however dismembered and divided in outward discipline and even in doctrinal belief, could be proof against the great centripetal force which in all other countries save England* is attracting so much attention to the great Synod of the Vatican. Catholics, Anglicans, Lutherans, Wesleyans, Presbyterians, Baptists—what you will—all who believe in the divine character and office of our Lord Jesus Christ, have a common meeting-point in topics such as these. Why should we allow our differences on other subjects to induce indifference as to these? Why should we in our haste to proclaim to the world our disunion on minor points, forget the absolute duty of union on the one great central point of all?

Each indeed has his quarrel with Rome, even the most Roman of us. The Anglican Reunionist who believes in Rome as being in the completest sense of the words the *One Visible Church*—the *ecclesia docens* of all generations—and who is prepared therefore to receive her whole authoritative teaching, and rejoices to find that there is no con-

* It might perhaps be said that America is equally indifferent to it. This is not the case, the American Church Press has had the start of us in this matter, and some months ago the Lutheran body in America initiated a policy of Reunion with Rome. No less than thirteen of their Synods have appointed Delegates to draw up a conciliatory address to the Holy Father in reply to his invitation.

tradition of it in that of his own communion—he who has the most reverential regard for her as *she professes to be*, nevertheless has a grievance against her *as she is*. He is ready indeed to erase from memory the mediæval abuses of the Papacy, impossible as is their future return ; he is ready to forget its intrusion into the civil order of the English Realm, and its many unjustifiable interferences with the duly delegated power and constitutional organisation of the Ecclesiastical Provinces and Dioceses of the English Church ; he is ready indeed to forget all this, but he most earnestly desires to see it once for all formally acknowledged as an extenuating feature in the history of our separation from the Apostolic See, and he is aggrieved at the charge of wilful schism so coldly and often so arrogantly brought against him. He is moreover aggrieved that in the face of what seems and ever will seem to him *plain historical proof* the validity of English orders and of the Sacraments he administers or receives has been (though not always)* and is now practically denied by her. Such are the grievances even of the most advanced among us. The bulk of the High Church Party again are indignant that Rome should assume the attitude of a teaching Church, when, according to their view, there never can be such until the three Communions have been first united. The Evangelicals in their turn, and with them the orthodox Dissenters, are aggrieved at her, and at the same time at us, for our supposed departure from the pure faith of Christ in attributing to it a Sacramental character, and associating with it a definite ecclesiastical organization. Every one of us therefore has his quarrel with Rome. But what are all these differences when weighed in the scale with our common faith, and our common love to our one only Lord, both God and Man.

* See the Bull of Pope Julius III., as given in Bishop Forbes on the Articles, Vol. II., p. 715.

And why should grievances like these be suffered to usurp the place of just and lawful—nay of *obligatory* sympathy with those who invite us to oppose with them the opponents of Christianity itself.

There are, alas ! many of the more Protestant among us in whose eyes no season however critical, no cause however precious, could justify a truce with Rome. With them she is, and ever will be, Anti-Christ, deadly, damnable, and doomed. They not only “un-church” her, they “un-christen” her altogether, and class her with the Infidel, the Hebrew, and the Turk. (*Note G.*) It were vain to sue them even for their prayers. To ask God to bless the deliberations of a Papal Synod, were, in their view, nothing short of hideous mockery of things divine. There is no hope indeed of sympathy from them. They must be left to thunder their well-intentioned yet narrow-minded anathemas from their Calvin Hall at Geneva, or from their well-worn platform in the Strand, or wherever else their contemplated “Evangelical” Council is to be held. They will have no more to say to the Vatican than Garibaldi and Louis Blanc in their proposed anti-Christian assembly at Naples, or Schenkel and the German Free-Christians in their recent conference at Worms. But we, the rest, who in spite of all our theological disagreements still regard our Roman brethren as fellow-Christians in deed and name, and who have had at last the courage to burst the shell of prejudice and bare an honest fairness to the day, we can surely not refuse to hide our differences for the time beneath the cloak of charity, and throw in our lot with the Council in one common effort to re-assert the claims of Christ among men, and prevent that terrible alienation of modern society from the Church of God which extremists on both sides seem so disastrously to threaten.

No opportunity could be more favourable for such a purpose than this. The tendencies of the age all combine to this result. On their bad side they are driving all thoughtful Christians, Priests and laymen, ecclesiastics and statesmen alike, to a union of their deliberative forces against them : whilst on their good side they are inducing that liberal spirit of equity and fairness which is so potent to break down old barriers of estrangement and suspicion. Those who are acquainted with the preparations which are being made for this great Council, have reason to believe that its sessions will extend over a long period, six or seven years at the least. Could we only consent to waive our points of disagreement, and spend the period of its session in this common work,—the very fact of having done this will make our after efforts for formal and complete Re-union so much easier. The mutual interchange of ideas, the more exact acquaintance with each other's forms of faith and modes of worship, as well as that easy and pleasant familiarity which must result from protracted personal intercommunion where such can be obtained,—all these, when united with a consciousness of our common interests, may be trusted to work silently and surely towards the wished-for end. Such a course as this, moreover, presents the best apparent means of restoring unity among ourselves. If we act at all in such a matter as this, we ought to act on *as broad a basis as possible*. We want to nurture large and generous sympathies, and not simply to consult the immediate interests of a numerically-speaking very insignificant section of the English Church. If the Catholic party in the Church of England is to be the means under God of restoring her to the Communion of the Apostolic See, it can never be by their own isolated, unassisted efforts. Nothing but a policy of coalition would seem adequate to such a task as this. We must be

ready to throw off every party-badge, and endeavour to unite together all those whose Christian hearts are large enough to be proof against that infatuated prejudice which finds absolutely *no* common ground with Rome. We must stretch out hands on either side. The Church of England owes both Rome and Dissent alike a heavy debt of reparation. How many generations long have we been slandering our Christian brethren of the West, in public and in private, training up our children in bitter hatred of their own lawful Mother Church of Rome, repeating and repeating to them with Pharisaic smile and self-complacent snuffle a version of her doctrines and practices the *utter and absolute mendacity* of which it would be hard to parallel even in the annals of theological controversy.* And how is it also with regard to Dissent? Is there any single sect in England the guilt of whose schism is not directly or indirectly chargeable in the main on us? To say nothing of the multitudes who though dwelling within sight of our very church-spires, have never even heard whether there be a God or no, and who are being swept along by the popular stream to the deep waters of a reckless and barbarous atheism.

Is this then a time to be brooding over old quarrels? to be resenting affronts, to be moaning out dismal prophecies

* It would be a very humiliating, though to the psychological and ethical student a very interesting work, should anyone ever undertake to write the history of popular untruth: but the saddest chapter of all would be that which treated of the relationship between idea and fact in the case of non-Roman conceptions of Roman teaching. So completely are these the reverse of truth, that this very contradiction forms the greatest obstacle in the way of their removal. On having the truth of these matters presented to us we are so much inclined to shake our heads, and say, "No! it is impossible that that can be the case; for how could the popular version of it ever have attained currency among us if it were so utterly at variance with the reality as it would on this supposition appear to be?"

of failure, to be sitting coldly by and saying—The Pope has not condescended to send our Bishops an invitation to the Council, *I*, therefore, can have nothing to say to it ; or, The Pope persists in calling his Council Œcumenical when it is nothing of the sort, nor ever can be ; that is enough for me ; I have washed my hands of the matter : or, again, I *hear* that those dreadful Ultramontanes are going to have it all their own way : or, I am *afraid* we are going to have new definitions of Faith about the Pope and the Blessed Virgin. Were it not wiser, in every way, and from every point of view human as well as Christian, simply to accept the matter as it stands, and to reflect that the Council, call it Œcumenical, Topical, Pan-Roman, or what you will, has been called ; that its work, or at any rate the greater portion of its work, will be such as all Orthodox Christians can and ought heartily to participate in ; and lastly, that, no matter what may be our forebodings, the issues of the Council are in the hand of God.

Would to God we could all approach the Holy Father and his Council in that beautiful spirit of humility and Christian love, in which one of our Church dignitaries has already addressed him ; one, too, whose staunch adherence to the good old type of Evangelicalism, secures him a perfect immunity from all application of that popular but barbarous term “ Romanizer.” I allude to one who bears the honoured name of Selwyn, and who writes as “ a Canon of the Church of England to His Holiness the Bishop of Rome.”* True, he refers at the outset of his letter to certain claims of modern Rome as seemingly inconsistent with that primitive standard to which he would himself appeal, but it is in no spirit of protest, but rather of quiet, affectionate entreaty.

* Published by Longmans, 1868.

"It grieves me, Holy Father," the letter runs, "to be constrained to speak one word of variance, while my heart's desire is for peace and unity, and while I feel that on the one great foundation, the faith of our Divine Lord, crucified for us, and risen from the dead, we are all united. My hope is that by thus uttering the thoughts which are the result of many anxious meditations, and of one unceasing prayer, day and night, a step has been taken towards the restoration of Apostolic faith and practice, and the reunion of Christian Churches long divided.

"With these feelings and this hope, I cannot bring myself even to mention, much less to discuss, the several particulars, in which we believe the Church of Rome to have diverged from the simplicity of the Primitive Catholic Church. All these will, we trust, be calmly and fully considered, in the light of Holy Scripture and of Apostolic order, when the Council of the Holy See shall be assembled, after the example of the first Council at Jerusalem, to deliberate for the welfare of the Church of Christ, under the guidance of His Holy Spirit."

And then the letter concludes :

"Holy Father, let me speak to you now, as I spoke to you before, face to face, in all true Christian love ; upon you, more than on any other human being, rests at this moment the hope of peace and unity for the family of Christ on earth ; right and reason are on your side in undertaking this work of reconciliation ; mercy and truth meet together to cheer and aid you ; the tide and current of public feeling—yea, among the members of your own Church—the progress of events in the world, the yearning desires of true Christians, are all with you ; the hearts of thousands, so long estranged from one another, will bless you for promoting their reunion in Christian brotherhood ; the Saviour who prayed that his followers might all be One in Him, will forward your endeavours by his approval and blessing ; upon you, Holy Father, and on the venerable Council of the Holy See, will rest the benediction of the Prince of Peace :

BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS."

The same spirit that breathes in this noble letter has since been displayed on a still more formal occasion, and in a place where the writer of it was acting in a distinctly official and representative character. During the recent debate in the Lower House of Convocation on Communion

with the Holy Eastern Church, Canon Selwyn is reported* to have spoken as follows :—

“ I am extremely anxious that, while we are holding out the hand of fellowship to all Churches who are united with us as regards the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith, and especially to bring about better relations between our own Church and the Eastern Church, nothing should be done which might have the effect of widening the separation between us and our Christian brethren of the Church of Rome. Whatever difficulties we may have to deal with in regard to that object, we should, I think, do nothing, either by word or deed, which might in any degree tend to prevent the possibility of an approach of that kind for with respect to intercommunion between Christian Churches, I still entertain the hope which I have before expressed that there may be, if not a union, at all events a near approach to a union, between the Western Church and ourselves.”

But, it may naturally be asked, granting that this Council is to meet, and that its objects are such as are described, yet what are we to do in the matter? We cannot all go to Rome. How then are we to take any practical part in the work of Reunion as connected with the approaching Synod at the Vatican.

There are indeed many things which we can do, as well as many things which it were well if we could not do. It were certainly well to restrain for the time being our traditional appetite for protests. Protests, on occasions like these, never have served, and never will serve any useful purpose. Let us be content to believe with Canon Selwyn that the opportunity of quiet discussion and explanation will come of itself all in due time either subsequently to, or coterminously with, the wider efforts of the Council to make God's ways in Christ known to a rapidly apostatising world. The real want now is to make amicable approaches towards each other, to make overtures of peace to everybody, and in every possible shape and form, to

* See *Guardian*, July 7.

stretch out hands of friendly welcome to all, to reject, protest against, or quarrel with none ; to make our minds a complete *tabula rasa* as regards old prejudices, antipathies, and misconceptions, and to start anew on the work of treaty and reconciliation. Let us not be afraid to speak plainly, as Canon Selwyn has done, of the possibility, nay, of the strong probability and most undoubted desirability of a *union with Rome*. Let us have lectures about it, pamphlets about it, newspaper articles about it, speeches about it, sermons about it. Let us talk about it in ordinary conversation (when the opportunity offers) with that air of familiar and confident expectation which carries with it the earnest of its own fulfilment, and irresistibly attracts the listener to share our sympathies and belief. We can only hope to deaden the sound of that popular war-cry "No peace with Rome," by making every act and every word of ours say quietly indeed, yet plainly and persistently, "Peace with Rome." People are getting less and less frightened of such a prospect every day. Public opinion is slowly yet steadily veering round. The Imperial Legislature, though not yet daring openly to join issue with the popular voice, has nevertheless during its recent debates distinctly relegated its own hereditary prejudices to the limbo of the past. The leading journal has already begun to write in a strain of Catholic sympathy* on that same Œcumenical Council, the very idea of which fifteen months ago it ridiculed as "an anachronism." Dr. McNeile's decanal vaticinations are received in the same quarter with a significant silence. "No-Popery" lectures, and "Confessional" tracts, long since the detestation of the educated world, are now the subject of magisterial interdict. And this change is not merely negative, it has its positive side as well. Ecclesias-

* See *Times* Article of Friday, July 9.

tical and political magnates of either communion are not afraid to meet together on the same public platform, and indulge in mutual felicitations on the existence of an opportunity for co-operating towards the public good;* whilst in private life those who but a few years since were exiled from their homes, disowned by their own flesh and blood, and only spoken of with bated breath and under pious cover of those epithets of mournful commiseration which we are wont to apply to our dead, are now freely—one might almost say ostentatiously—welcomed in all ranks and forms of society. Each summer as it comes round sees thousands and thousands of those to whom in past years the very sight of a cross on a church-gable was a fingerpost of warning, now freely entering the great temples of Continental Catholicism, and assisting with outward reverence, if not with intelligent devotion at their services. It is impossible to help recognizing this turn of the public tide towards reciprocity with Rome: it is equally impossible to stem it. Let us take courage from all this to shake off our former very natural hesitation and reserve, and openly and steadily to proclaim that we *will* have peace with Rome. We have now reached that point at which all diffidence, all compromise, all timid half-measures should cease. Let us hope to have seen the last of those prudential saving-clauses, those neatly-balanced manifestoes wherein we have been wont to compensate what *we* profess to hold, with safe repudiations of what *others* hold, or rather are popularly, yet most erroneously supposed to hold. The times demand a simpler, stronger course. It is in the interest of the whole Church of Christ, it is in the interest of political order, it is in the interest of the peaceful civilization and harmonious develop-

* The allusion is to recent meetings on the "Intemperance" question.

ment of the human race, that these estrangements in the Christian family should cease. Our cause is good. We have no need to be ashamed of it. Let us frankly and fearlessly avow it to be ours.

It were folly, however, to suppose that the golden year has already come, and that we are going to sign a Concordat between Lambeth and the Vatican to-morrow. We are many years, it may be decades off that. A whole generation of new religious thought and practice has to be educated to maturity; a new national attitude as regards the relations of Christian bodies has to be taken up; the calumnies, perversions, misunderstandings, and ignorances of three centuries have to be answered and removed on both sides,—not violently, not controversially, but by the slow, sober, laborious process of historical investigation and accurate documentary proof. It may be that Council after Council, Conference after Conference, may meet and meet again, before we see the realization of our hopes. Nevertheless, it is well for us to know what our goal is, however distant, and to keep it steadily in view at every intervening stage of the course. The full recognition of the scope and end of a work is the surest guarantee of its being promptly undertaken, and we all know the truth of the proverb about the work begun. The main point which it has been the endeavour of these few pages to enforce is that the time for seriously inaugurating this direct work of Reunion has now come, and that if we allow this Council to meet and separate again without any approach on our part, we shall have lost an opportunity which, in itself, can never recur, and the very neglect of which will make any subsequent attempts at reconciliation all the more difficult. The precise form in which such an approach ought to be made it were perhaps premature to discuss now. But let us at any rate determine at once that

somehow or other it shall be made, and no doubt the course of events in the few important months that are to follow, or else the deliberations of the many wise and experienced among us who may make the matter their concern, will suggest some means of carrying our determination into effect.

Meanwhile, as individuals, we need not be idle. We can all do something towards "ventilation"—as the phrase is, whether in speech or writing. Only let us do it in a large and generous spirit. There are many sides to the question; many lines of approach to it; many interests involved in it; many real practical difficulties to be overcome; many hearts to be won to the great cause of Christian Union. We cannot be too scrupulous in our care not to injure such a noble service by any attitude of exclusiveness, any unnecessary obtrusion of our own private crotchets and predilections. In a matter like this, and particularly at the initial stage of it, we want practical sympathy rather than dogmatic precision; we want a little less theology perhaps, and certainly a vast deal more love. There are, of course, some special points in which the Catholic School in the Church of England has peculiar affinity with the Council, and the practical representation of which would necessarily involve a distinct line of action on its own particular basis. But that need not prevent our joining in other efforts to obtain some far more comprehensive recognition from every section of the National Church. Let us hope that it is not impossible to initiate something in which our non-conforming brethren could also join. Some of them have already addressed the Holy Father in view of the approaching Council on matters of interest to us all. They have proclaimed their sense of the need in which mankind stands at the present day of some authoritative centre for the maintenance of unity,

justice, and peace, and for preserving to the people, in face of all the violence of the age, their individual and domestic rights. They desire to see in the great Head of the Christian Family on earth a kind of universal Guardian of the rights of men, whose utterances, even if they should not avail to bind the ruling powers, might at least be recognised as a standard of appeal by all peaceful and reflecting men.

As those who bear the name of Christ and believe His Person and Mission to be Divine—as those who desire to see peace and unity restored in the great Christian family—as those who feel the need of some vigorous, determined, and wide-spread effort on the part of Christianity to reassert her office and work among men ; as those who dwelling in a land of liberty themselves desire to see the reign of justice, order, and peace established throughout the world ; we could *all* unite in some expression of thankfulness that such a gathering of Christian chiefs and counselors should have been summoned, and of interest in the great work of regeneration they have set themselves to undertake. None need feel compromised by such an act as this ; none, save those whose hostility to Rome is beyond the reach of reason, could fairly decline to participate in it. And the mere fact of such a recognition as this having been accorded, the mere fact of our having so far broken through our traditional insularity as to express ourselves in terms of courteous greeting and Christian sympathy towards our brethren of the Church of Rome, will have done more to heal the wounds of a divided Christendom than anything which has been hitherto attempted.

Such a step moreover as this has a direct practical bearing upon our more formal relations with the Council, apart from its value as a general indication of our desire for the restoration of Christian Unity. Though there are many

ways of a more unofficial and miscellaneous character in which the feeling of the English Church may be brought under the cognizance of the Roman Communion, nothing short of the actual presence at the Council of members of the Anglican Episcopate can be held in the end to be an adequate and satisfactory channel of its expression. But no one surely who reflects upon the somewhat dependent attitude as regards the State which our Episcopate is wont to adopt in the exercise of its corporate functions, and its traditionary reluctance to act upon its inherent spiritual authority, can doubt for a moment that some strong expression of sympathy upon the part of a considerable body of the clergy and laity must necessarily precede any such action on their part as a recognition of the Council would demand. To those who from very laudable motives of deference and subordination, would urge that we must wait for the Bishops to take the initiative in this matter, the history of the last half century or more of our Church life forms the most cogent answer. Had the old maxim "do nothing without the Bishop"—a maxim which presupposes for its application a normal and perfect condition of ecclesiastical life and discipline, such as we have not known for many a century, and which we are very far from having attained to yet—had this in itself most excellent maxim been the watchword of the Anglican Communion during the past fifty years, where should we have been now? Certainly not in a position to dream of any communication with Rome. It is no exaggeration to say that every single revival of doctrine or practice which has characterized the successive stages of this great regenerating movement in the English Church has been due to the action of the clergy and laity not only independently of, but often in actual opposition to the wishes of the Episcopate. Neither

could it, humanly speaking, have been otherwise. An Episcopate which stands in that relation to the State which our own occupies could never inaugurate, it can only ratify and adopt phases of belief and practice already largely accepted by the Communion at the head of which it stands. Neither on the other hand could a work such as this have won its way had the directing impulse proceeded from any other source than from the main body of the Church, as distinct from its rulers. That same position of affinity with State power which, because that power has been unfavourable to such a movement, has prevented the Episcopate from urging it on, would on the opposite supposition have proved equally prejudicial to its reception by the body of the Church at the hands of the Episcopate. And as each preliminary and intervening stage of this Revival from Wesley onwards has been achieved in advance, so to speak, of the Episcopal stand-point, so this final stage of all must be characterized by the same antecedent action on the part of the lower orders of the Church. The great problem now awaiting solution is how to get the Anglican Bishops to Rome. And the only reasonable chance of solving it is to be found in the gradual influence of Church opinion acting upon them and slowly and surely impelling them in the desired direction. The *Solvitur Ambulando* process is a very good prescription in a case where the walking powers can be freely employed, and there is no demand for the supply of an exterior motive force. But our Bishops, fettered as they are by the traditions of state office can hardly be regarded, morally speaking, as free agents in such a matter as this. No doubt there is much in the present aspect of the political world, and its distant mutterings of Disestablishment, which will tend to throw them more and more upon their own spiritual resources; and

there have not been wanting significant tokens of late that they are beginning to sit looser to the temporal saddle, and keep a keener eye upon the only solid ground of Episcopal power and authority. Be it ours to strengthen and intensify this disposition by constant endeavours to support them in their adoption of a more fearless and independent line of action. There is an opportunity in this case for doing something of this kind which might very fairly be taken advantage of. Every member of the Church of England who believes at all in the necessity of lawful ordination must be interested in any attempt to vindicate in the eyes of Christendom our claims to possess the Apostolic Ministry.* We might surely therefore petition our Episcopate to undertake this office on our behalf. We might remind them of the fact that it is the *communis sententia* of the largest and most important section of Christendom that we do not really possess this most essential qualification of a Christian Church. We might further point out to them that the approaching gathering of the Bishops of that Communion presents a most desirable opportunity for taking some steps to remove this—as we consider it—most erroneous impression. The petition might suggest the appointment of a joint Committee of both Houses of Convocation to investigate the question fully in all its bearings, and to draw up a brief, yet complete statement of the case, to be forwarded

* It is matter of great satisfaction to know that the publication of a work of this kind is already being undertaken under the sanction of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that the list of subscribers to it includes men of all shades of theological opinion. It will be sufficient to mention such names as Earls Beauchamp and Harrowby, Lord Ebury, the Bishop of Oxford, the Bishop of St. David's, the Rev. Canon Payne Smith, and Dean Stanley, to indicate the wide-spread character of the interest which the proposed work is exciting.

together with all existing documentary evidence to Rome for the information of the Western Episcopate. Such a step as this could hardly be considered to compromise any one, and it would afford a very obvious and natural opportunity for an accompanying letter of Christian greeting on the part of our own Communion should our Provincial Synods feel prepared to avail themselves of it. It might perhaps at the same time be urged on our Episcopate that the Church of England has always expressed her desire to appeal in all matters of dispute to a future General Council, and that as a General Council has now been called, to refuse to avail ourselves of the invitation to attend it, would be a serious deflection from our own professed standard of ecclesiastical rule and adjudicature.

But beyond and above such a step as this we ought to make an endeavour at any rate to unite not only all sections of our own Communion, but also all Orthodox Nonconformists, in some more general and comprehensive expression of their interest in this most important undertaking, and of their hopes and prayers for its most successful issue, to the glory of God, to the joy of our common Lord and Saviour, and to the welfare of all mankind.

The question of Anglican Orders, vitally important as it is to ourselves, is not a subject in which we can expect other separated bodies to take any interest whatsoever; neither again, does it ostensibly form any part of that more general programme of work which the Council has been summoned to undertake, and in the accomplishment of which the whole orthodox Christian world, episcopal and non-episcopal alike, ought to show a deep and lively concern. Such a comprehensive act of friendly recognition as this we can only hope to elicit when the public mind in England has really become alive to the fact that the Council is going to

meet, and when the proposed scope and probable issue of its work has assumed its rightful position in the general talk of the day. If the foregoing remarks should at all contribute to bring the whole question of the coming Council into greater prominence, they will have achieved the purpose in view of which they have been written.

NOTES.

(Note A.)

THE BRANCH-CHURCH THEORY.

The so-called Branch-Church Theory has always seemed to me to be exposed to two very great difficulties. The first is the one already alluded to in the text, viz., that it requires us to believe that the normal action of the Church for teaching purposes has been suffered to remain in abeyance for fully one half the Christian era, and that half one which has presented, generally speaking, quite as much demand for the exercise of her infallibility, if not more, than the other. For surely the intellectual development of man since the Great Schism has been as rapid as before, and *doctrinal* controversy (at least in the West) as rife as in the earlier centuries of the Church: neither, one would think, were the *moral* dangers attending the rise and growth of Protestantism less than those induced by Arianism; nay, if we consider the *directly* pernicious tendency of some of the salient features of Lutheran and Calvinistic error, we should be constrained to believe they were more so.

The other great difficulty in the Theory is that it implies that throughout that same period *by far the largest*, most active, and most influential of the Three Branches has been allowed by God practically to demand from the faithful in communion with her an implicit reliance on her doctrinal decisions as definitely and finally infallible, whereas on the contrary they really were not so.

The more we face these two difficulties the more hopeless seems the task of reconciling them either with any reasonable

à priori view of a teaching Church, or with a due fulfilment of the Scriptural promises which we are accustomed to apply to it. Surely no more terrible defeat from the gates of hell could be imagined than is involved in this latter difficulty ! Conceive the total shipwreck of all faith among the *one hundred and sixty millions* in communion with the Holy See which would ensue, were a Council of Reunited Christendom to decree (as according to this Theory it is possible that it should) that even one single doctrine which they and their forefathers for thirteen generations of man have (on the strength of Roman Decrees) held to be part of the infallible Word of God, was after all a mere human invention.

I am aware that it has recently been questioned whether the Roman Church does demand of those in communion with her a belief in her infallibility. All I can say in reply is, that if she does not, she does not believe in the infallibility of the Church at all, for she claims precisely the same belief in the Tridentine Decrees as in those of Nice. Every convert on his reception is made to acknowledge that the Creed of Pius IV. is "the true Catholic faith, out of which no one can be saved," which is in itself tantamount to asserting Rome's Infallibility, for it is only on her authority that this Creed rests. He is also made to say, as part of this Creed,—“I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and *particularly by the holy Council of Trent.*”

Another assertion also lately made, that the Church of Rome has never considered herself to be the *whole* Church of Christ, is in a *certain* sense true ; that is, that unfortunately “the Roman Communion”—and “the whole company of the baptized” are not synonymous terms. But in doing this she does not mean to recognise the Branch Theory of Churches, for she would include the non-episcopal baptized, as well as the episcopal in this division.

(Note B.)

THE ROYAL SUPREMACY.

The proposition in the text, viz : that there is nothing to which we are pledged as loyal members of the Anglican Communion which is irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome, is of course one, the proof of which is far too long to be given here. We can only refer the reader to such books as Tract XC., Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon, Bishop Forbes and Sancta Clara on the Thirty-Nine Articles, and other similar publications, for the demonstration of it. Until these works are thoroughly refuted, we of the Catholic School can only reiterate our belief in the truth of the above proposition. We have stated it, and proved it ; and the whole *onus probandi* in the matter rests now with our opponents. When they have seriously undertaken to prove the contrary to the satisfaction of impartial arbitrators of neither School, then it will be time enough for them and for others to talk about the dishonesty of the Reunionists.

We have only time and space here just to touch upon one of the points in dispute in which recent events have tended to confirm in a very remarkable degree the Catholic interpretation of our Formularies. I allude to the question of the Royal Supremacy.

The popular and traditional view of this doctrine is that the English Sovereign is to the Church in England what the Pope is, or is supposed to be, to the Church in so-called Catholic Countries : and that the Church of England in her formularies on this head refers every possible authority to the Sovereign, to the total exclusion of any other power. The popular view maintains, in fact, that there is no sense in which the Royal Supremacy is not affirmed, and no sense in which the prerogatives of the Apostolic See are not denied by our Communion. That has been the view held for generations past, and is the view still taken by a numerical majority of English people.

The Catholic interpretation of these formularies on the other hand is this.

There are in this world two kingdoms, a natural and a supernatural, a secular and a spiritual. They form, as it were, two orders; each claiming a divine origin and authority, yet each operating in a different sphere: they form two societies, having distinct provinces, and distinct orders of development and control: they were intended by God to work harmoniously side by side, and ought so to work; each observing its own bounds; neither invading the territory or usurping the prerogatives of the other. The one order is civil, the other is spiritual; the one is called the State, the other the Church.

The pre-Reformation history of England in its relations to the Papal See presents a series of struggles on the part of the English Crown, and often (though not always) on the part of the English Episcopate, to maintain this equilibrium, and to protect the civil Society from those encroachments on the part of the spiritual to which the prevailing policy of the Court of Rome so often exposed it. That English soil should ever have become the *fief* of the Pope; that it should ever have been held to be the duty of a civil subject to murder his civil lord, because that lord had been excommunicated by the Holy See; that it ever should have been thought desirable that because one man is called to an office, however high, in the spiritual kingdom, he should therefore be in the least degree less subject to the civil power than his neighbours; that it ever should have been thought justifiable that the possessions, patronage, ecclesiastical discipline and prerogatives (diocesan and provincial) of the Church of England should have been usurped by a foreign court, and treated as so much secular merchandize held in perpetuity for the benefit of an Italian Prince—these and such-like truly damnable doctrines and practices equally subversive of both kingdoms, natural and supernatural, are a sad subject of contemplation to the student of mediæval history, and it is against them that the Church of England, ante-Reformation and post-Reformation alike, has in the most emphatic language steadily and continuously protested.

With the exception of a few isolated instances in the earlier mediæval times when, owing no doubt in a great measure to the peculiar circumstances of the day, the authorities of the English Church somewhat forgot their duty to the English State, and suffered things spiritual to intrude into things civil; and passing by on the other hand a few brief years when a certain king, on whose reign history has passed a verdict which, for the sake of his benefactions to a certain place of learning, I had rather not particularise—when he, I say, forced her into an acknowledgment (though not without a significant proviso) *practically* amounting to an encroachment on the other side, to an intrusion, that is, of the civil order into the spiritual: with these exceptions, the Church of England has remained true to her mission of maintaining the balance between these two powers, and securing, as far as possible, that mutual independence which is essential to their harmonious co-operation, as well as to their legitimate development side by side.* The Church is not to interfere with the Realm. Royal authority remains the same in its own civil province despite all the thunders of the Vatican. Let no subject dare to rebel against an excommunicate prince. “The powers that

* The reader might perhaps be inclined to cite the present Court of Final Appeal as an instance of the intrusion of the civil into the spiritual. Unfairly, I think; for the Judicial Committee makes no pretence to *spiritual* action whatever. It is simply a Court of Interpretation for a certain section of Statute Law; that is all it claims to be, and *as such* we have no quarrel with it. The real grievance is that its members are wholly incompetent to fulfil their duties. That section of Statute Law which this Court has to deal with requires a special knowledge (*viz.*, of Canon Law and Theology) which none of Her Majesty's Judicial Committee, as a rule, can be expected to possess. We do not wish to see the Court altered from a lay tribunal, we only wish that it might be composed of laymen really versed in ecclesiastical law and theological terminology. We should then be spared the humiliating spectacle of a Lord Chancellor pronouncing a judgment which shows about as accurate an acquaintance with the technicalities of the case, as a country parson's charity sermon might with the provisions and machinery of the Bankruptcy Court. We have no objection whatever to a Royal Judge, but we should like to be able to say of our Agrippa, that “we thought ourselves happy to have to answer before him . . . especially because we knew him to be expert in all customs and questions that are among us.”

be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth that power (no matter whether it be wielded by a Nero or a St. Louis) resisteth the ordinance of God." In the civil empire of Great Britain—"within this Realm," as the phrase goes—no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction whatsoever.* To the Queen's Majesty the chief government of *all* estates in all causes doth appertain, independent of any such foreign jurisdiction (Article 37). In the language of Academical Tests we hold her authority to be "in hominibus summam, et externorum Episcoporum jurisdictioni minime subjectam." No person, whatever be his office in the kingdom of grace, not even the Pope himself if an English subject, is exempt from the majesty of English civil law, nor allowed in any sense to exercise a control over it, save in so far as any *civil* position and influence he may have may enable him to do so. The Bishop of Rome, *quâ* an ecclesiastic, has absolutely no jurisdiction in this *Realm* of England. (Article 37.) The Rulers of the natural order have "a prerogative given by God Himself; that is, that they should rule *all* estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers" (*ibid*). That is what the Church of England teaches as regards the inviolable rights of the Civil order.

But does she not on the other hand as jealously guard the prerogatives of the supernatural Kingdom of Grace? Yes, most certainly. "We give not (as slanderous folks say) to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments." (Art. 37.) Each, she says, in his own order. Princes have to do with the Realm, not with the Church. They minister God's laws in the natural kingdom, not His Word and Sacraments in the supernatural. "We leave," the Church

* See the Sermon of the Dean of Westminster, preached in the Abbey on Sunday the 20th of June last, being the anniversary of the Queen's Accession. After quoting this passage from the Oath of Supremacy he is reported to have said, "That was in other words to say, that no institution or person however venerable or sacred could interfere with the allegiance of Christ's ministers to their own country and their own laws."

of England makes the sovereign say,—“we leave the Church free to fulfil its gracious mission in God’s own appointed way, through its own spiritual machinery and organization. It is a regular society, like our own; having laws of its own, operations of its own, a visible hierarchy and government of its own. It has no right to intrude into the civil order, unless we suffer it of our own consent and appointment to do so; but neither on the other hand do we claim any jurisdiction over it.”

Such is the Catholic view of the Formularies bearing upon the relations of State and Church, natural authority and supernatural, or, in controversial language,—the Royal Supremacy and Papal Jurisdiction. The two terms are to a certain extent co-relatives. In whatever sense the Pope encroached upon the laws and liberties of the civil order and forced his jurisdiction into it, in that sense the Papal Supremacy has been rejected, and the Royal Supremacy asserted; *but only in that sense*.* There is nothing whatever in the attitude of the Church of England on this great question which is inconsistent with a thoroughly Catholic belief as regards the supernatural prerogatives of the Holy See. The Church of England is absolutely silent as to any repudiation of them in their purely spiritual aspect.† She leaves it *perfectly free to her members* to recognise in the Pope the Father of

* Bramhall, Anglo-Catholic Library, Vol. II., pp. 553—4. “Let any man look upon our grievances, and he cannot doubt that we made our separation from the Court of Rome, not from the Church of Rome. All our sufferings were from the Roman Court; then why should we seek for ease but where our shoe did wring us? And as our grievances, so our reformation, was only of the abuses of the Roman Court; their bestowing of prelacies and dignities in England to the prejudice of the right patrons; their convocating Synods in England without the king’s leave; their prohibiting English prelates to make their own feudal oaths to the king, &c. . . . These are *all* the branches of Papal power that we have rejected. This reformation is *all* the separation that we have made in point of discipline.”

† The reader will remember that Hallam (see *Constit. History*, Vol. I., p. 67, ed. 1846) has observed that this side of the Papal Office was entirely forgotten at the time of the Reformation. The *abuse* of the prerogatives of the Holy See had come to be regarded as the *only* existing aspect of it.

the Faithful, the First Bishop in Christendom, the Supreme Pontiff, the visible Head and Centre of Christ's supernatural kingdom on earth. They are free to adopt, with their Roman Catholic brethren, any of the current "pious opinions" they may choose as regards his special position and office in its relations to the whole Church of Christ, from the highest of Infallibility Theories downwards. *Only*, they are *not* free to recognise in him any authority, or jurisdiction spiritual* or ecclesiastical which can interfere in any way whatsoever with the *civil majesty of the law*. So far as regards his spiritual

* As to the phrase "spiritual jurisdiction," it is, as all ecclesiastical lawyers know, used in a peculiar sense in *English Canon Law*, and not in the sense in which Roman Canonists use it. I adduce two unimpeachable witnesses in favour of this further "*equivocatio*" between England and Rome.

Speaking of Lord Shaftesbury's proposed Church Discipline Bill, the *Record* in a laudatory article on it writes, (Feb. 17, 1869): "It is not meant to apply to such jurisdiction as Bishops have by God's Word, but only that *external coercive* authority which *we call* spiritual jurisdiction," and which (such is the force of the argument) is given by the State.

Again at a little later period, in commenting on Mr. Disraeli's ingenious paradox that the Roman Catholic Church was already established in Ireland, we have the following passage:—

"The true distinctions between spiritual authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction were stated in Lord Romilly's Judgment in the Natal case, and had been previously more fully developed in some of Dr. Archibald Stephens' ecclesiastical arguments. The Church, as a Divine institution, has an "authority" of its own, but the State alone confers "jurisdiction;" and this principle has been acknowledged and acted on from the commencement of the connexion between Church and State. It is especially recognized in the first statute of Edward VI., c. 2, where it is stated that "all authority of *jurisdiction*, spiritual and temporal, is derived and deduced from the King's Majesty." The term was correctly used in its proper sense by our Reformers, skilled as they were in the Canon Law; but, in the succeeding century their followers, not so well taught, were betrayed into the snare of taking the word in the sense of the *Roman Canonists*, and have thus perplexed the consciences of many as to the meaning of the Reformation statutes. "The term *jurisdiction*," says Dr. Stephens, "expresses only that external coercive power over the bodies and properties of men which God has given to temporal governors. It appears that all *jurisdiction* is from the Crown. When conferred on spiritual persons as *spiritual* persons, or courts, it is called 'spiritual jurisdiction.' When conferred on temporal judges it is called 'temporal jurisdiction.'"

authority in Christ's Holy Catholic Church the Communion to which we belong pledges us to no repudiation of it whatsoever. It is only in the *Realm* that his *jurisdiction* is repudiated (Art. 37), and "jurisdiction," if we are to believe Dr. Stephens, is not the same as "authority," whilst "Realm" and "Church," it is needless to remark, are terms not merely not synonymous, but absolutely exclusive the one of the other.*

The "Royal Supremacy" then which the Church of England so stoutly maintains is one to which "Non-Conformists" are amenable equally with ourselves.† Archbishop Manning

* See Ordinal, "As this Church *and* Realm hath received the same."

† Exception must here be made as regards that aspect of the "Church of England," in which it is *established* or incorporated into the State. This is called "The State Ecclesiastical" (see Canons) of which Nonconformists do not form a part. It is to this we refer when we say that the "Queen's Majesty is over all causes (as well as persons) civil and *ecclesiastical* supreme." These causes are such as relate to the discipline, &c., of the Church of England as an *Establishment*, engrafted that is *into the civil order* by a kind of Concordat, as in other countries where the Church is established and supported by the State. To the popular mind the distinction between "the Church" and "the Establishment" is simply a distinction in terms, and it would be hopeless to attempt to remove it in the limited space here at command. Those who wish to understand this most vital distinction are referred to Art. XV. in the volume of the *Union Review* for 1864, as also to Mr. John Walter Lea's letter to Mr. Mackonochie on the recent Judgment of the Privy Council in the S. Alban's case. Of course if ever we should be committed by any fair application of the terms of this Concordat to anything essentially un-Catholic as regards the Holy See, precisely the same difficulties would arise, as would arise, for instance, should the Privy Council pronounce an un-Catholic judgment in the Eucharistic Doctrine Case. Either the Concordat must be modified or dissolved, and the Establishment cease, or else Catholics will cease to hold their office of spiritual police in the "State Ecclesiastical," and lapse into "Nonconformists" in communion with the See of Canterbury and the Apostolic Church of this land. Should, however, the Church herself in her independent and spiritual capacity proceed to ratify the judgment, and require the same un-Catholic doctrine to be held by her members, then Catholics would have to renounce their allegiance to the Church, as well as to the Establishment, and either form a Free Church of their own, or, if the Roman Communion by that time shall have ceased (in the matter of Anglican Orders) to require all English Priests to believe that two and two make five, return at once into visible communion with the Holy See.

submits to it equally with Archbishop Tait although (owing to the sphere of his episcopal operations being a somewhat different one) he has not the advantage of a periodical reference to the Anglican Articles to convince him of its necessity. It is a doctrine again of which Catholic France no less than Protestant England acknowledges the force and justice.

But it is needless to enlarge upon this matter further. We have only adduced it, because recent events, fresh in Parliamentary and legal memories, have stamped the Catholic interpretation of these formularies with a verdict of public approbation which is beyond all possibility of reversal. The assertion by the Church of England of the Royal Supremacy in the sense which *tradition* has assigned to it is now shown to have been a pure creation of the popular fancy. The bubble was so fair and precious in Protestant eyes, that it was handed on tenderly and delicately enough from one generation to another, but at last stern fact has blown unkindly upon it, and it has burst once and for ever, as many another will after it. Let us take courage from this and bide our time, and we shall sooner or later find that the so-called Catholic Interpretation of the Formularies of our Church will come to be generally recognised among impartial Englishmen as the soundest and most consistent that can be put upon them.

It is just worth while to observe in conclusion that this question of the due balance and legitimate relation of the civil and spiritual order, is one which (owing to the unhappy condition of things in many parts of the Continent) *must* form part of the programme of deliberations at the approaching Council. In very many places abroad—as if in retaliation for mediæval usurpations on the other side—the civil order has been recently encroaching upon the spiritual. There is perhaps no country in the world in which these most important relations are so fairly maintained in *theory* as in our own, though in practice (as, for instance in the *congé d'élire*, and in Convocation matters) the civil authority has been allowed to overstep the limits of the Concordat between them.

(Note C.)

ON THE MEANING OF THE PHRASE "REUNION WITH ROME."

One of the greatest difficulties which we have to face in this Reunion question is the prevailing *ignorance* as regards the real meaning of the word "Rome" in such a phrase as the above. There are many who would be far more bold and explicit in the expression of their desires in this respect, if it were not for the terrible misrepresentations to which this almost universal ignorance exposes them. I must therefore beg the ordinary English reader of this pamphlet to give me credit for speaking the truth when I say that when he uses the phrase "Reunion with *Rome*," he really means something completely different by the word "Rome," to what the Reunionist means by it. His idea of "Rome" is the result of a three-century-old tradition, which had at the time of its origin very *considerable foundation in fact*, owing to the *widespread corruption of the Mediæval Church*, but which subsequent reforms rendered wholly untrue as afterwards applied. We English are apt to speak of our "pure and reformed" Church, as if we implied that there was some other Church which has *not* been purified and reformed, but still retains its mediæval corruptions and depravity. As apparently neither Macaulay nor Hallam have been able to convince the British public of the utter and entire absurdity of their views on this subject, it would be folly in me to make any attempt to do so: I must therefore allow them to retain possession of their pet idea in defiance of the plainest statements of fact as given by their own Protestant historians. But I must in self-defence beg the ordinary reader to believe me when I say that when I use the phrase "Church of Rome" I do not refer to any religious community sanctioning doctrines and practices, such as he (under that term) attributes to it. If there is any reader who has (1) studied an ordinary Roman Catechism, (2) applied to a Roman Priest to know if he *has rightly understood its phraseology* and (3) afterwards mixed with Roman Catholic Laity,

and seen how all these doctrines there taught are *practically applied* in the lives of the faithful,—*then* I will allow that he understands the phrase in question in my sense. But till he has done this I must in the name of justice protest against the prevalent practice of charging Reunionists with favouring a religious system they would be the very first to condemn. If “Rome” really meant what in the popular phrase “No peace with Rome” it always does mean, we should be the last to advocate “Reunion with Rome.”

It should also be added, to prevent misconceptions of another kind, that no Reunionist has the slightest idea that “Reunion with Rome” would imply the introduction into the Church of England all at once, or perhaps even at any time, of the full system of discipline and devotion as practised at present in the “Church of Rome.” All that would be required of us would be our assent to what is absolutely *de fide* in their Communion. On all such points as are not of the “*de esse*” but of the “*de bene esse*” of the Church, no person who has had much communication with Roman theologians on the subject of Reunion could doubt for a moment that the terms of the Concordat between us and Rome would leave the English Episcopate perfectly free to act as prudence, and the practical necessities of our condition as a Communion might dictate. Under this head would of course come such questions as Clerical Celibacy, Communion in both kinds, Vernacular Liturgy, &c., &c., which are not even now compulsory throughout the whole of the Churches in Communion with the See of S. Peter.

(Note D.)

THE HOLY EASTERN CHURCH AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN
POLAND.

It is a sad task to call attention to the unfavourable side of things, where we could wish to see all things at their best,

but as the conduct of the Easterns in this matter of the Council has been so much lauded to the depreciation of their Roman brethren, it is perhaps well to remind the reader that there is another matter in which their conduct, when regarded from a Re-union point of view, is open to very serious criticism. I allude to the way in which the Russian Episcopate has quietly permitted the extermination of the Catholic Church in Poland. Of course we must not judge the conduct of the Russian Government by the more civilized standard of Western polities, but even after every allowance has been made in this respect, the conduct of Russia towards the Poles in the matter of their national Church is perhaps the blackest chapter in the history of modern Europe.* One after another Bishops and Priests have been removed by the iron-hand of the civil power for no other offence save their adherence to the Christian Faith as professed by their forefathers. The final page of this most tragic history is being written now.

* We refer here of course to the Polish Provinces (Litthauen, Wolhynien, and Podolien), not to the so-called Polish kingdom. It is to be hoped that the storm of indignation which must burst out in Europe when the real facts of this persecution become generally known, will be in time to save the westernmost part of Poland from similar treatment. It is of course very difficult at present to ascertain exactly the extent of the persecution which has now been raging under all the secrecy of an iron despotism for the last five years or more; but from private and thoroughly authentic sources I learn that the facts actually made public are far short of the reality. Within this period according to already published statements there have been—

	PERSONS.
Sent to Siberia (including 179 Priests and 164 women)	18,682
Imprisoned in the heart of Russia (163 Priests and 218 women)	12,556
Sent to the Ural Provinces	33,780
Sentenced to the Army... ..	2,416
Temporarily imprisoned, and then sent to Siberia ...	31,500
Died in prison before sentence	620
	<hr/>
	99,554

In the province of Litthauen alone during one year (1866) 25,470 Catholics were forced by the rigour of persecution to renounce their faith and join the Russian Church.

The sole surviving Bishop was banished last month,* and the country is now left desolate to die the death of spiritual starvation to which its alien rulers have doomed it. And yet what has the Russian Church done to save its sons from lending their orthodox hands to this inhuman and ungodly persecution? What word of consolation have these Christian Bishops sent to stay and comfort their brother Bishops in their bitter hour of trial? If ever brother's blood cried aloud for vengeance, this sad tragedy will demand a heavy act of reparation from that Erastian Communion, which ought to have protested, if it were only in the name of a common humanity, against this bigotry of their imperial lord.

Can we wonder that Pius IX., to whom this poor Church of Poland has been the cause of such constant and painful solicitude, should, with all his forgiving benevolence, have abstained from any very strong expressions of affection for an Episcopate which had thus shown itself to be so ungenerous, so un-Christian, so utterly alien to the true spirit of Catholic unity.

Anxious as we may be to see the Greek and Roman Episcopates once more united, the more we examine their present relations with each other the more hopeless the prospect becomes. It would seem as if nothing could bring them together again save the kindly office of a mediator. May it be England's part to fulfil that Christian task! It surely is not beyond the reach of possibility that it shall be, but it obviously cannot happen until we ourselves have come to a better understanding with our own Mother Church of the West.

* More recent information still announces his death on the journey. There is, however, it seems, one Bishop left, Juszyński, a very old man, whose comparative innocuousness has as yet saved him from the fate of his brother Bishops.

(Note E.)

ANGLICAN ORDERS, ETC.

None but those who have mixed freely with Roman Catholics abroad can have any idea of the imperfect character of their notions respecting the English Church. One bearing the Episcopal office expressed his astonishment to me the other day when I mentioned something about our confirmations, "He did not know we had any at all; he thought they had been entirely discarded at the Reformation!" Even in the case of those who do interest themselves very much in English affairs, and get our Prayer Book and study it, it is remarkable to find how easily they may be misled unless they have some one to explain matters to them. Talking about Anglican Orders the other day with one of them, I quoted our Ordinal. He said, "Ah! but you surely do not *use* that, do you? It is not part of your Common Prayer; it stands right at the end of the book as if banished there because it was not wanted." Not knowing the method on which our present book had been compiled he had expected to find it along with the Confirmation, Marriage, and other Sacramental Offices, in the body of the book.

It is remarkable what a very different view continental theologians take of the question of our Orders to that adopted on this side of the channel. They all regard it as a pure *quæstio facti*, and nothing more. I was talking the other day on this subject to the editor of one of the ablest of the foreign Catholic Reviews—one the "Catholicism" of which our Anglo-Roman friends must admit to be beyond all suspicion, inasmuch as it espoused the side of the *Dublin Review* in the great Ward v. Ryder controversy. He, in common with nearly the whole body of continental Catholics, had inherited the idea that Parker had never been consecrated, &c., and that the line of our succession was in consequence broken. However, when I assured him we could produce documentary evidence in favour of the contrary proposition, he said,—“Can you?

We have never heard of the existence of it. Why don't you get everything *printed at once*; every single deed and document bearing on the question, and send it to the Council. It is a pure *quæstio facti*, and *all* that is required is evidence." I then alluded to the more recent phases of the controversy in England, especially to the line adopted by one who had set aside the historical question, as a dreary theme, of purely antiquarian interest. "Set aside the historical question!" he said, "Why, that is the *only thing* he has to take into his consideration!" Again, wherever I have mentioned the other arguments, such as our priests having been bad *custodes*, &c., and our supposed carelessness in the matter of baptisms, I have always had the same reply: "These matters have nothing to do with the question. Such arguments would tend to invalidate every existent priesthood; to state them is to refute them," &c., &c. I have scarcely found any—and I have mixed with men of all schools from the highest form of Ultramontanism downwards—who regarded it as anything else but a pure *quæstio facti*. Arguments such as those currently employed in England against the Catholic Revival find no favour abroad, and it is impossible to help feeling that a not unnatural re-action on the part of converts who learnt their first theological lessons from a very narrow school among ourselves, has been allowed to obscure that fairness and perspicuity of judgment which ought to characterize all Christian controversy.

In the course of the same conversation alluded to above, I had another very significant indication of the different tone adopted towards us on the other side of the Channel. After we had spoken of Anglican Orders, my companion went on to attack me in a friendly way on the subject of the Articles. "Those 'Thirty-nine Articles of yours,'" he said, "they are a very unsatisfactory document; you can put any interpretation you like on them almost, according to the point of view from which you approach them, Catholic, Lutheran, or Calvinist." "Yes," said I, "that is certainly true; but then we, as professed members of 'The Church,' *i. e.*, not of this or that Branch, or National section of it, but of Christ's Holy Catholic

Church,* are bound to approach them from a Catholic point of view. We are moreover, from the very nature of the case, obliged to read these Articles in the light of the doctrines and practices contained in our Book of Common Prayer, for *that* is the theological manual of us *all*, clergy and laity alike ; it is out of the Prayer Book that we are taught the Faith of Christ, both as children in learning the Catechism, and as adults in taking our part in the offices of the Church. We cannot *help*, therefore, approaching them from the Prayer Book point of view. Moreover, on the subject most in dispute, viz., her Sacramental teaching, the Church expressly refers us in her Canons (see Canon LVII.), to the Prayer Book, and not to the Articles, for a full and complete statement of her Doctrines. We have, therefore, her own authority, as well as the practical requirements of the natural course and order of things, for approaching the Articles from the Prayer Book point of view." "Yes," he replied, "I see that :"—and then putting of his own accord the finishing point to my argument, he added,—“and your Prayer Book, we all allow, is *thoroughly Catholic!*”

* Our Prayer Book on its very title-page tells us that it only provides us with a national “use,” not a distinct National Church, or National Creed. It speaks of “the Sacraments, &c., of *the Church*,” that is the *whole*, of which the “United Church of England and Ireland” is the *part*. Our Church offices and formularies are simply the local version of an Ecumenical system of doctrine and worship ; they are the vernacular edition, so to speak, of a Catholic original. They imply in their very preamble the existence of a universal standard of faith and practice according to which we, as members of “the Church,” are bound to accept and interpret them. The Catholic explanation of the formularies, then, is not only the right one on *a priori* grounds, but it is actually of *obligation* according to the *a posteriori* requirements of our Prayer Book itself.

(Note F.)

ON THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONS OF THE TEMPORAL
GOVERNMENT TO THE SPIRITUAL.

There seems to be some misconception as regards Catholic teaching on this point. About this time last year I remember showing an article in the *Church News* (see No. 63, June 24, 1868), on this subject to a Roman Catholic friend of mine.* The article professed to be based on some utterances in the *Civiltà*, which it interpreted to mean that the "temporal power must be *subservient* to the spiritual." The *Civiltà* had ascribed all the evils of the day to the "independence of the civil power," and argued (according to the *Church News*), that "kings were therefore to be subject to the Pope." My friend assured me that that was a wholly mistaken view of the matter, and that no such induction could have been intended. All that the article meant was that these evils are to be ascribed to what we call "secularism," *i. e.*, the separation of the civil power from *Christian principle*, not its independence of *ecclesiastical* control. The syllogism is this: for a Government to be perfect it must be in harmony with Christian principles and have a Christian ruler. But a Christian ruler will (according to the Catholic view) be ready to profess his faith in the spiritual prerogatives of the Church as summed up and expressed, as it were, in the office of the Holy See. Apart therefore from this recognition no perfect Government can exist. The Catholic view, as I understand it, does not imply that such a recognition is in any sense an act of *civil* or *political* subservience to a foreign jurisdiction, or that where this recognition is not accorded, and the Government therefore so far an imperfect one, Catholics, priests and laity alike, are not equally bound to submit to it, and to abstain from any interference (*quà* ecclesiastics) with its political provisions. Every one will be ready to admit that no more loyal subjects could

* It is worth while remarking that having received his theological training for the priesthood at Rome, his sympathies would naturally incline him to take the strictest view of the matter.

be found all the world over than those of our fellow countrymen who are already in communion with the Holy See, nor can the Protestant King of Prussia point to more devoted adherents than his Catholic subjects of the Rhine Provinces. The grounds upon which ecclesiastical authority would oppose itself to civil law in a country like Austria are those of protesting against a *breach of contract*. Where a Concordat has been made, there the State has to a certain extent pledged itself to Christian legislation, and if therefore it enacts laws contrary to the Christian principle, it necessarily places itself in the wrong, and justifies a certain degree of remonstrance on the part of the Church, by way of protest.

(*Note G.*)

ON PROTESTANT PREJUDICE.

It is most extraordinary how the force of prejudice lingers on, and exerts its influence, almost unconsciously, even in the great centres of educated and liberal thought. It was not long since that signatures were attached to a document petitioning for the abolition of Tests in a certain place of learning. The petitioners were made to state that numerous students had been placed under disabilities owing to their not conforming to the Church of England as by law established. It instanced cases of Presbyterians, Baptists, Independents, and so forth; and then having, as it were, exhausted in this paragraph the various forms of non-conforming *Christianity*, it went on in a separate clause to instance further the case of "members of the Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Parsee persuasions." It is not to be supposed for a moment that this insult on two-thirds of the Christian world was deliberate and intentional; it was simply an unconscious expression of a hereditary and conventional view of things. But when such

stupid bigotry as this can be put into print and circulated in one of the very centres of educational enlightenment, we cannot be surprised at the tenacity with which those who live in the darker and less liberal parts of the country cling to their long-cherished traditions. "Members of the Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Parsee persuasions!" *We* surely are not the people to complain of the Pope's "Protestantes aliosque Acatholicos."

A clergyman—apparently of the High Church school—got into conversation with me the other day on religious topics. In the course of it he quoted a decree of the Council of Trent as an instance of logical contradiction. I ventured to suggest that his interpretation of the words was not that given by Roman Catholics themselves, and that their interpretation was not open to the objections he had urged. Nothing, however, could induce him to allow that the ordinary rule of life whereby a man is allowed to be the ultimate judge of the meaning of his own words was applicable to the Roman Catholic Church as well as to other people. For others indeed there might be such an appeal, but not for them. In spite of all their indignant protestations against being charged with maintaining doctrines they would be themselves the first to repudiate, they, nevertheless, were to be judged, in this gentleman's opinion, according to the sense which their opponents choose to put upon their words, and not their own. This is a very common form of prejudice, and the most fruitful source of variance and untruth.

On another occasion a well-to-do man of the world was talking to me about "those Ritualists, and all their abominable idolatries." He had just come from London, and was evidently still burning with indignation at the mummeries of a S. Alban's service, which he had recently attended. He instanced something, I forget now what, which had especially aggravated him. I endeavoured to pacify him by explaining to him that he had entirely misunderstood its use and intention. "Misunderstood, Sir!" said he, testily, "how could I? I saw it with my very eyes!" "Well, Sir," said I, "I merely remarked that that at any rate is the meaning *they* attach to

it, and I suppose we ought to judge them by their own version of the practice, and not ours." "No, Sir; I don't *believe* them at all, any more than I would a Romanist; they are all liars, every one of them!" "I thought, Sir, it was a rule of life always to believe your fellow-men, unless you *knew* them to be telling a falsehood?" "Yes, Sir, fellow-men, Sir; yes. But I don't consider a Romanist a fellow-man, Sir; he belongs to a different race altogether, *and we cannot be expected to treat them as we do other people!*"

This last sentiment has been a favourite one with the English nation during the last three hundred years, and has several times met with the distinct approval and sanction of the Imperial Legislature. Let us hope that its last dying wail was heard issuing from the walls of a northern Deanery not long ago,* and that the nation is at length putting away from it these degrading and senseless prejudices "like a bad dream."

Extracts from Letters, &c., on the Council.

The following are taken from the letters of a foreign Catholic who has lately been at Rome on Conciliar business, and who can therefore speak with authority on the subject. In answer to the question whether the Anglican Bishops have been summoned or not to the Council, he says:—

"The Pope wished to invite everybody to attend the Council who has a right to do so. It is for each to see if he has the right, and if he believes he has the right, he is summoned (not only invited)† to

* See *Times*, of May 19th.

† The "Apostolical Letters" whether to Greeks or Protestants are in no sense their summons to the Council, but separate addresses urging their acceptance of the summons already given in the Bull of Indiction.

come to the Council. But every body, Catholic Bishops included, will have to justify their titles or prove their right to attend. Your Bishops therefore would have to come prepared with the proofs of their Episcopacy. . . . If your Bishops have not yet received personal invitations to attend, they are no worse off than some of us. For we have not all received our invitations."

Again, in reply to a question about the *Civiltà*, he says:—

"On my mentioning to a person high in office at Rome the bad effect produced in England by the correspondence of the *Civiltà*, he replied, by way of disavowal, It is *not* official. And other persons too of great importance have assured me that it does not correspond at all with the official feeling at Rome."

Again :—

"I found every one at Rome ready to welcome the English Church, even beyond my hopes, . . . but they can do nothing until you *yourselves* make approaches."

Another writes :—

"Our Superior has lately returned. He is constantly speaking of the extreme spirit of moderation and the conciliatory disposition which reigns in all circles at Rome."

It is pertinent to add that the said Superior is on the one Committee which according to the *Allgemeine Zeitung* is at the bottom of all the mischief, and which is presided over by that "hare-brained enthusiast" (*sic*) Cardinal Reisach.

Extract from a Letter from a Catholic Priest in Saxony.

"What advances you are making in England and how widely real Church feeling seems to be spreading among you! Every one I am sure who has the cause of the Church and the welfare of mankind at heart must rejoice in this gradual restoration of the Anglican Communion to her rightful position in the kingdom of grace, and unite his prayers with yours for God's blessing on its further progress. Such a work as this, however, is not to be accomplished in a few years only, and a long period of time must yet elapse before the great mass of the people, and particularly the more influential section of them, can be brought to take the Catholic view of things, and show their readiness to forward the cause of Reunion. With regard to the Church in general, it will be everywhere an enormous task to restore her to that position of influence which she formerly occupied in Europe and by virtue of which alone she will be able to meet the requirements of the times and be successful in bringing

wanderers back again into her fold. I do not myself think that this approaching Council will itself effect the Reunion of any of the separated bodies, though I hope to see it *lay the foundation* of such Reunion. In this view of the case I am delighted to hear that the notion is entertained of inviting the Council to investigate the evidence in favour of your Orders, for whatever may be the issue of such an invitation, it will have at any rate constituted a formal act of approach on your part, and an express evidence of your desire for Reunion. How would it be if you made the sending of the necessary documents, &c., an occasion for also stating, as it were, in a letter of introduction, your general intentions as regards Reunion, and inviting the Council to establish a basis on which the work could be carried on through its several stages to its final end. I have little doubt that an invitation of this kind would be most joyfully welcomed, and it would certainly aid in giving clearness and precision to the views of your own theologians, as well as afford an impetus to fresh study and research, and eventually perhaps conduce to the attainment of yet higher ground than that already occupied by you. Of course I cannot tell if you are ripe for such a step as this, and whether it could hope for success on your side; still, to judge from what I already know of the movement I should anticipate more good than harm from the attempt. I do not in the least degree share the current apprehensions as regards new definitions of faith, &c., being made at the coming Council. These would certainly be a serious obstacle in the way of Reunion. It is perhaps just possible that the question of the Infallibility of the highest office in the Church may be *debated*, yet it would hardly come to more than that. What could we gain by a definition on this point? Certainly not much. At the best that here and there an isolated point of controversy would meet with a speedier settlement, and a few unruly spirits be sooner brought to order. But when I reflect that for 1800 years, throughout so many obstinate struggles, with far less opportunity for ascertaining the opinion of distant Bishops individually, and far greater difficulties in the way of assembling the united Episcopate in Council, the Church has nevertheless won its way without such a dogma, she certainly can manage to continue to do so a few centuries more. I am sure that the practical common sense of the Bishops, who know so well the state of the world at this present time, will pronounce such a question to be, to say the least, inopportune. As Priests and instructors we have even now quite enough to do to explain the dogmas already decreed, and to remove the thousand and one prejudices that exist against them, and even in this task we are not always successful. We should therefore be exceedingly loath to see the number of these doctrines, which are so easily perverted and misunderstood, increased even by a single addition. I am not however in the least degree *anxious* about all this, for since I believe that the deliberations of such an assembly are under the guidance of the Holy Spirit I cannot but trust that under any circumstances their issues will be in perfect conformity with the will of God. Should the result defeat our own private wishes and anticipations, then we must still see God's hand in it all, and submit our own wills to His. When, however, I think of the Council of Trent and am

reminded both by the actual history of the debates, as well as by the resultant form of the decrees themselves, with what prudence and deliberation the Fathers went to work, I cannot but believe that on this present occasion too, the men of our time will approach the whole business submitted to them with the same grave, cautious, and conscientious laboriousness. You may observe, as it seems to me, even in current Catholic literature, how very little countenance exaggerated and one-sided views receive as a rule from the Episcopate, and that they emanate almost entirely from those who have nothing to do with the practical work of the Church, but are simply engaged in speculative studies, or at the best from men whose experience in such work has been of a very limited nature. I entertain therefore no misgivings as regards the Council *on this head*. Its decrees and resolutions will no doubt excite considerable opposition, but that will not be due to their own contents so much as to the tendencies and customs of our age which contain, as we all, alas! must acknowledge, so much which is of an essentially anti-Christian character."

To the above letter so full of sound practical wisdom as well as of friendly sympathy for our Communion, I subjoin the utterance of one of our own Anglican Bishops on the desirability of a General Council for restoring the Unity of Christendom. May his words prove as prophetic as they are wise. They were written, of course, *before* the Indiction of the Council.

After speaking of the theory of Councils in their relation to Princes as expressed in our Article, he says that, however wise such a theory might have been three centuries ago, "it is in view of the actual condition of the world, and of modern theories of dominion, an utter impossibility," and that no living Prince could now undertake to summon one. He then proceeds:—

"What then remains to be done? There is but one power on earth which is able to attempt this great work. Let the successor of S. Peter, Bramhall's *Principium Unitatis*, the holder of that See, whose *potior principalitas* was acknowledged by S. Irenæus accept the higher destiny which God has placed in his hand, as being, not as in past times the cause of disunion, but the principle of reunion in Christendom. Let him send forth his invitation not

merely to all the Bishops of his own subjection, but let him invite first his own to testify to tradition and to judge freely in matters submitted to them. Then let him invite the ancient Eastern hierarchies, not as "prudent persons exercising ecclesiastical functions," but as the successors, as in fact they are, of the ancient thrones of New Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Let him summon the Anglican prelates, not prejudging the doubts of their jurisdiction, but accepting them as they are historically, the occupants of the Chairs of S. Austin and S. Paulinus. Let him call to himself all that is still sound in the Lutheran and Calvinistic bodies, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear, and then in free Council assembled, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, let every question be discussed, every difficulty sifted. Let the fullest explanations be given of what has given offence and promoted disunion; let the remaining superstitions left untouched by the Council of Trent be honestly dealt with; let the balancing and complementary truths that interpret the more startling assertions of the Church be enunciated; let the most candid and generous construction be placed upon the utterances of all the separate limbs of the Body of Christ; let a sound Catholic Philosophy be sanctioned; let the deep underlying distinctions of race be allowed for; let the demarcation between faith and opinion be drawn with a firm and tender hand; so shall the great cause of Re-union be promoted, the rent vesture of Christ repaired, the walls of partition broken down, and the reign of Christ the Lord over the world be inaugurated."—*The Bishop of Brechin on the Thirty Nine Articles*, Vol. II., pp. 812—814.

It would seem presumptuous to add any words to such a passage as this; at the same time, considering what unfair judgments are current among us, it is well to remind the reader that if our Bishops have not been summoned "as the occupants of the Sees of S. Austin and S. Paulinus," they have nevertheless actually been summoned by the Bull of Indiction, in precisely the same way as the Bishops who are in communion with the Apostolic See. Considering how long we have allowed the prevailing doubts concerning their historical position as occupants of those Sees to pass unchallenged, it is, perhaps, hardly reasonable to expect from Rome any *spontaneous* recognition of this their lawful occupancy. It is clearly our business, not Rome's, to satisfy Christendom of the validity of Anglican Orders. We are the accused; it is ours to plead "Not Guilty," and call our witnesses. Until we have ourselves brought the matter under the notice of the Holy See, we cannot fairly expect a reversal of the Gordon

precedent.* An opportunity is now presented for obtaining that reversal, in the acceptance by our Bishops of the summons given in the Bull. The responsibility will rest with us and not with Rome if that precedent becomes stereotyped. To say that it is unwise to solicit such a reversal for fear of provoking a renewed condemnation, is tantamount to saying either that we have misgivings ourselves about our case, or that we cannot trust a Council of godly and learned Christian Bishops to give an impartial verdict. The first alternative is of course fatal to our position as Anglicans,—for doubt in such a matter is spiritual death;—the second, besides savouring of ungenerous and un-Christian suspicions, implies a distrust in the Reunion movement as under the special providence of God, as well as a serious want of faith in the Divine guidance of Church Synods. To say—as it were in justification of these suspicions—that our Episcopate has been already “ignored,” is simply untrue. It has been recognised so far as our own conduct in the matter allows it to be recognised. Any further recognition of it is out of the question until we have done our duty, and professed our readiness to attend the Council to which we have been summoned. To a General Council the Church of England has always appealed, and—as Bishop Forbes clearly points out in the above passage—no one save the Pope could at the present day be expected to summon one. He *has* summoned one, for *all* who claim to attend it; and it would be a lasting disgrace to the Anglican Communion if she allowed timorous distrust, insular apathy, or a refusal to place herself in the position of others before judging of the value of their acts, to prevent her acting up to her own acknowledged standard of appeal, and frankly and generously accepting in the true spirit of Christian charity the invitation thus accorded her. If no such step is taken during the next few years, no surprise can be felt if Anglicans begin to lose faith in the professed Catholicity of their Communion,

* It must not be forgotten that this sentence of the Holy See was only passed on the evidence laid before it. The petitioner prayed to have his Anglican Orders pronounced *invalid*, and such evidence only was produced, as was calculated to further his suit.

and fall back on an individual instead of a corporate line of action. The recognition of the absolute necessity for Reunion is now too widely spread among priests and laity to render any such indifference on the part of our own Episcopate a safe or prudent policy. If the Church of England is to be kept together in coming storms, it can only be by the strong cords of Divine charity, and to give the cold shoulder to more than two-thirds of our fellow-Christians, on an occasion on which the interests of the whole world are at stake, is a violation of its laws for which no sympathy with Greeks and with Dissenters, however righteous and desirable in itself, can be an adequate reparation.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY G. J. PALMER, 32, LITTLE QUEEN STREET, LINCOLN'S INN
FIELDS.

By the same Author,

Second Edition, much enlarged, (680 pages,) Price 7s. 6d. ; by Post, 8s.

THE KISS OF PEACE;

OR,

ENGLAND AND ROME AT ONE ON THE DOCTRINE OF
THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

*N.B. Purchasers of the Original Essay can obtain the whole of the
New Matter in this Edition separately, under the title of*

SEQUEL TO THE KISS OF PEACE.

Price 5s. 6d. ; by Post, 5s. 10d.

REMARKS ON THE FIRST EDITION.

"The man who believes that 'the Presence of Christ depends on the act of consecration, not of participation; on the act, that is, of the priest, not of the communicant,' is, of course, 'at one with Rome' on the Eucharistic doctrine; and we are bound to say that the writer does no violence to the language of the Prayer Book in his deductions from it. His conclusions are fairly involved in his quotations from the authorised teachings of the English Church."—*The Nonconformist*.

"The importance of this little book is in inverse ratio to its size. . . . It is a book we are reluctant to condemn: yet one which it is impossible to approve."—*Record*.

"In this essay we have a mass of thought and matter and argument packed up in an unpretending form and in a few pages, which it would have taken many writers of great experience four times the space to express with far less clearness but with far greater dogmatism. That such a book as this should have been produced at all must be a matter of great thankfulness with all earnest-minded, thoughtful men."—*Church Review*.

"It is quite refreshing to have from the pen of an Anglican writer statements characterised with some degree of accuracy on a metaphysical subject."—*Church News*.

"The argument is well sustained throughout, and the book worth reading."—*Literary Churchman*.

"The 'Kiss of Peace' is a remarkable essay. Its object is to reconcile doctrines on the Eucharist. The author deserves great credit for the fairness with which the various views are stated, and, as becomes an Eirenicon, he sets down nothing in malice or exaggeration."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

"We sincerely trust that this exceedingly clear and convincing essay will be widely read amongst men of all parties, and especially amongst English theologians, in whom, even when their instincts are thoroughly Catholic, there is often considerable confusion of ideas."—*Church Times*.

"The 'Kiss of Peace' is a very remarkable book . . . Every step in the line of reasoning is taken with due care and eminent consideration of what has to be assumed and proved, and the result is a treatise, concise, lucid, and logical, of the very highest value and importance."—*Union Review*.

"The author of the 'Kiss of Peace' has done admirable service to the cause of Christian unity. He has written a careful, thoughtful, earnest book, to show that the differences between ourselves and Rome are a matter of words and definitions, and not of things and doctrines."—*Ecclesiastic*.

J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square, S.W.









